

PROCEEDINGS



National Convention
of the
Socialist Party



1 9 0 8



NATIONAL CONVENTION
OF THE
SOCIALIST PARTY

HELD AT
Chicago Illinois, May 10 to 17, 1908

STENOGRAPHIC REPORT BY
Wilson E. McDermut, assisted by Charles W. Phillips
and Isabel MacLean

Edited by
JOHN M. WORK

Published by
THE SOCIALIST PARTY

J. MAHLON BARNES, National Secretary

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS



THE LIBRARY
THE UNIVERSITY
OF TEXAS

NOV 1918
BOUND

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

National Convention, Socialist Party

Held in Chicago, Ill., May 10 to 17, 1908

FIRST DAY'S SESSION

The Third National Convention of the Socialist Party of America met at Brand's Hall, Chicago, Illinois, Sunday, May 10, 1908, at 12 o'clock noon.

The National Secretary, J. Mahlon Barnes, called the convention to order as follows:

"Chicago, May 10, 1908.

"Comrades: The National Constitution of the Socialist Party provides that the National Committee shall decide the time and place of holding national conventions. By a vote of the National Committee closing Jan. 14, 1908, Chicago was chosen as the city, and by a vote closing Feb. 4, 1908, this day, May 10th, was selected for the assembling of the national convention. In accordance with the above record and by authority of the National Committee of the Socialist Party, I now call the national convention of the Socialist Party to order. The first thing will be the nomination of a temporary chairman. Nominations will be in order."

Temporary Organization.

Del. Hillquit, of New York, was chosen chairman of the session.

Del. Hillquit on taking the chair, spoke as follows:

Comrades, contrary to the usual custom, I shall not make a speech. I have figured out, comrades, that this convention will spend about \$15,000. Figuring at the rate of six days, it means \$2,500 a day. On the basis of the eight-hour working day, that is \$300 an hour, or \$5 a minute. Now, comrades, every point of order made here costs \$10 to the party. Every appeal from the decision of the chair is \$15. Every ten minutes consumed is \$50. I think I have myself already expended something like \$8 of the party's money so far. I call your attention to that in order that we may remember the virtue of brevity in our discussions. And I think, comrades, we will best bear it in mind if you will just remember at all times, first, that we have some very important matters and some that are very much less essential, and that we want to preserve some measure of proportion. Next, when a limit of time is assigned to you, say five or ten minutes, you have the right to consume all of the time, but you do not have the absolute duty to do so. Again, I suppose you will remember the duties before us and the fact that among all these 219 delegates there is not one who

511236

does not have the best interests of his party at heart and therefore we will avoid all sorts of acrimony in our discussions. We will now proceed to the business of the convention. What is your pleasure?

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): I wish to make a motion, in adopting rules governing the preliminary proceedings, that all speeches for any purpose whatever during this organization be limited to three minutes. (Seconded.) Carried.

DEL. WORK (Iowa): I move that we proceed to the election of a temporary secretary.

The motion was seconded and carried.

Del. Heath of Wisconsin was elected temporary secretary.

Communications.

The secretary read the following communications:

London, May 9, 1908.—Chairman National Convention Socialist Party, Chicago. National Council, Independent Labor Party, Great Britain sends fraternal greetings and best wishes for success of convention. (Signed) Ramsay McDonald, M. P., Chairman; Francis Johnson, Secretary. (Applause.)

(Translation:) National Convention Socialist Party, Chicago. We wish you perfect agreement in your councils and success in the coming battle. (Signed) Social Democratic Party of Austria, per Scari. (Applause.)

Greetings to the convention of Socialist Party, Chicago. Our local sends to all comrades to the convention and National Committee greetings. (Signed) Bohemian Local, Socialist Party, Bridgeport, Ohio.

West Concord, New Hampshire, May 7, 1908.—To the delegates and comrades in convention assembled, greeting. Being unable to attend the convention on account of illness at home, I wish to join my alternate comrades Arnstein of Dover and Wilkins, our State Secretary, delegates from New Hampshire in extending to you the hearty co-operation of the Socialists of New Hampshire, wishing you God speed in your deliberations in this convention, which is destined to be a history-making event. The eyes of the world are upon you. The arch enemy, capitalism, through its

blinded tools, is watching for the breaking of the fraternal bonds. The militant proletarian hordes are watching you, expecting a policy and position so firm and strong that it will be insurmountable, and a platform so clear, scientific and revolutionary, that it will carry consternation into the enemy's ranks, inspire the hearts of the toilers with zeal and interest until the millions shall declare for the Socialist cause. We hope to have the honor, privilege and pleasure of voting for William D. Haywood as our standard bearer of 1908. Fraternally yours, W. H. McFall, State Organizer. (Applause.)

Baltimore, Md., May 8, 1908.—Chairman, National Socialist Convention, Brand's Hall, Chicago, Ill. Branch 44, Workmen's Circle sends fraternal greeting.

Pittsburg, Pa., May 10, 1908.—Permanent Chairman, Socialist Convention, Brand's Hall, Chicago. Accept greetings from Pittsburg victims of a plutocratic prosperity. Hope this convention will mark an epoch in the history of the inevitable emancipation of the class conscious workers. (Signed) 7th and 8th Ward Branch.

Baltimore, Md., May 10.—Chairman National Socialist Convention. Branch 6, Socialist Party, Baltimore, sends fraternal greetings and rises to second the nomination of Debs. (Signed) H. Grossman.

New York City, May 10, 1908.—Convention Socialist Party, Brand's Hall. Heartiest greetings to you all. May your work be crowned with success. Three cheers for Socialism. (Signed) Arbeiter Ring, Branch 1.

Committee on Credentials.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): I move that a committee of seven be appointed to pass on the credentials and report to this convention, to decide who are delegates and who are not. (Seconded.)

DEL. OSBORNE (Cal.): I move as an amendment that that committee of seven be elected by the convention and not appointed. (Seconded.)

The amendment was carried.

The following nominees accepted the nomination for committee on credentials: Reilly, Untermann, Clark, Boylan, Graham, Tuck, Solomon, Schwartz, Boomer, Gaylord.

It was moved and seconded that the ten nominees accepting constitute the committee. Carried.

Letter to President of U. S.

DEL. HOEHN (Mo.): I would like to get unanimous consent of the convention to a very important matter that will not take over \$5 worth of time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrade Hoehn of Missouri applies for unanimous consent to speak one minute on a very urgent matter. Is there any objection to the request of Comrade Hoehn? There seems to be no objection. Comrade Hoehn has sixty seconds for an urgent matter.

DEL. HOEHN: Mr. Chairman and Comrades, I believe the United States Supreme Court is not in session to-

day, hence it cannot take out an injunction against the introduction of the following open letter to President Roosevelt:

"Open letter to President Roosevelt, White House, Washington, D. C.:—Chicago, Ill., May 10, 1908. Sir:—In your last special message to Congress you raised the question of class consciousness; as the highest executive officer of this great American Republic—"

DEL. SPARGO (N. Y.): I rise to a point of order. That is by no stretch of the imagination a question of urgency.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point of order is well taken.

It was voted to hand in the credentials and adjourn until 3 o'clock.

AFTERNOON SESSION

Chairman Hillquit called the convention to order at 3 o'clock.

Report of Committee on Rules Elected By National Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand the Credential Committee is not ready to report yet. Now, if you do not want to waste any time I suggest that we take up the following business: The National Committee some time ago elected a Committee on Rules. That committee was not elected by the convention, but I understand it has performed its duties and has its report ready. I would suggest that this convention might ratify the election and make that committee a committee of the convention. I further suggest that we start in with the consideration of the rules. While it is not fully in accord with parliamentary practice, we can discuss it and, we might assume that as we will when organized as a convention confirm our action, in this way we might save considerable time while waiting for the Committee on Credentials. If the convention agrees with the proposition I will entertain motions to that effect.

DEL. SLAYTON (Pa.): I move you that both suggestions be concurred in, namely, that the committee be ratified and that we proceed with the consideration of the report. (Seconded.) Carried.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): Before the report is read I suggest—there is no motion necessary—that the Committee on Rules read their suggestions, and unless there is objection, without any formal action, that it be considered as carried as the sense of the body, to save time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Unless there is any objection to this mode of procedure, it will be followed.

Del. Stedman then read the following report:

The Committee on Rules respectfully reports the following for the rules and order of business governing this convention:

1. A chairman shall be elected at the commencement of each day's session.

2. A permanent secretary and two assistants shall be elected for the entire convention and may be selected from outside the body of delegates.

3. The secretary may select one or more reading clerks to assist him.

4. A sergeant-at-arms and assistants shall be appointed by the chairman at the first day's session, such sergeant-at-arms and assistants to act throughout the entire convention.

5. The sergeant-at-arms shall appoint five pages and five messengers who shall act under his supervision.

6. Four tellers and two judges to count all ballots shall be elected for

the entire convention.

7. A Committee on Platform, which shall consist of nine members shall be elected by the convention.

8. A Committee on Resolutions shall be elected to consist of nine members.

9. A Committee on Constitution shall be elected to consist of nine members.

10. A Committee on Women and Their Relationship to the Socialist Party shall be elected, to consist of nine members.

11. A Press Committee shall be elected, to consist of five members.

12. An Auditing Committee of five members shall be elected.

13. A Committee on Ways and Means shall be elected to consist of nine members.

14. A Committee on General Program shall be elected to consist of nine members.

15. A Committee on Farmers' Program shall be elected to consist of seven members.

16. A Committee on Immigration shall be elected to consist of five members.

17. A Committee on the Relation of Foreign Speaking Organizations shall be elected to consist of five members.

18. Discussions shall be limited to ten minutes for each speaker. No speaker shall speak a second time until all desiring to use their time shall have had an opportunity to speak.

19. The sessions of the convention shall begin at 9:30 a. m. and continue to 12 noon, and from 1:30 p. m. to 6 p. m., and night sessions shall be held from 7:30 to 9:30 p. m. only when such sessions shall be provided for by motion during the day's proceedings.

20. Roberts' Rules of Order shall be used, with the exception that when the previous question has been called for two delegates on each side of the question shall be allowed three minutes each for closing the debate before the question is put.

21. During the sessions of the convention no smoking shall be allowed on the floor of the convention.

22. Each delegation shall select one of its members to announce its votes.

23. Each state delegation, in the

absence of any regular delegates shall designate the alternate who shall fill such vacancy.

24. The National Secretary shall have a voice, but no vote.

25. In case of a contest, the delegates, both contesting and contested, shall not vote upon such contest.

26. The election of International Delegate.

27. A committee of seven on the Nebraska situation shall be selected.

28. The nomination of President and Vice-President shall be by at least a two-thirds vote of the delegates present.

DEL. STEDMAN: The order of business follows, but I do not think it is essential that it should be read at the present time, as your order of business will change depending upon modifications of the rules. For instance, you might eliminate some or add some others. Just to that extent the order of business will naturally be modified; so that the report proper is before the convention. We will now take it up if you wish and read it seriatim.

THE CHAIRMAN: You will bear in mind, comrades, if you have any objection to any section read, please state your objection, otherwise it will be considered as approved.

The report was then taken up and considered section by section. The first section was read as follows:

1. A chairman shall be elected at the commencement of each day's session.

Adopted.

Section 2 was read, as follows:

2. A permanent secretary and two assistants shall be elected for the entire convention and may be selected outside from the body of delegates.

Adopted.

Section 3 was read, as follows:

3. The secretary may select one or more reading clerks to assist him.

THE CHAIRMAN: No objection. It is adopted.

Section 4 was read as follows:

4. A sergeant-at-arms and assistants shall be appointed by the chairman at the first session, such sergeant-at-arms and assistants to act throughout the entire convention.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any objection?

DEL. KILLINGBECK (N. J.): Does this also make it possible that

we can elect a sergeant-at-arms outside of the delegates?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I would so interpret it.

DEL. STEDMAN: I will include that if you wish.

DEL. FRAENCKEL (Ill.): I would say that I object. We can go down to the police headquarters and get a sergeant-at-arms.

DEL. STEDMAN: I will read this with the suggestion embodied: "A sergeant-at-arms and assistants shall be appointed by the chairman at the first session, such sergeant-at-arms and assistants to act throughout the entire convention, who may be selected from outside the delegates."

THE CHAIRMAN: Any objection? If not, we will consider it adopted.

The next section was read as follows:

5. The sergeant-at-arms shall appoint five pages and five messengers, who may be appointed from those outside of the convention, and who shall act under his supervision.

Amended so as to strike out "five pages" and make it ten messengers. Adopted as amended.

The next section was read, as follows:

6. Four tellers and two judges to count all ballots shall be elected for the entire convention.

Adopted.

The next section was then read:

7. A Committee on Platform, which shall consist of nine members, shall be elected by the convention.

DEL. O. F. BRANSTETTER (Okla.): I move an amendment providing that not more than one of these committee men shall be from the same state on each committee. (Seconded.) And if in order and to save further time I would like to make this apply to all these committees, so as to save the time of taking it up with each committee.

Carried. Section adopted as amended.

DEL. STEDMAN: I have it now as changed: "A Committee on Platform, which shall consist of nine members, shall be elected by the convention. Not more than one member shall be elected from any one state delegation." Strike out the word "one," so as to read "from any state delegation."

The next section was read:

8. A Committee on Platform shall be elected, to consist of nine members; not more than one member shall be from any state delegation.

DEL. WORK (Iowa): I move that the platforms submitted by the Platform Committee of the National Committee be referred to this Committee on Platform.

Carried.

DEL. BERLYN (Ill.): I move that the present platform of the party be also referred to the committee. (Seconded.)

Carried. Section adopted.

The next section was read:

8. A Committee on Resolutions shall be elected, to consist of nine members; not more than one member from any state delegation shall serve.

Adopted.

Section 9 was next read, as follows:

9. A Committee on Constitution shall be elected, to consist of nine members, only one to serve from any state.

Adopted.

The next section was read:

10. A Committee on Women and Their Relationship to the Socialist Party shall be elected, to consist of nine members.

Adopted.

The next section was read as follows:

11. A Press Committee shall be elected to consist of five members.

Adopted.

The next section was read:

12. An Auditing Committee of five members shall be elected.

Adopted.

The next section was read:

13. A Committee on Ways and Means shall be elected to consist of nine members.

Adopted.

The next section was read:

14. A Committee on General Program shall be elected, to consist of nine members.

DEL. STEDMAN: You will remember there was a Program Committee at the last convention, and Comrade Simons suggested it might be revised. That program was published and submitted to the last convention and referred for editing to the National Committee, and on that

committee was Comrade Simons, to edit the program.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us understand, comrade. I would like first to have the committee explain what is meant. That a few of the immediate demands contained in the national platform can be taken out and embodied in this general program?

DEL. BERLYN (Ill.): The way I look upon this is this: We got this up four years ago, and we are apparently going to do it here. It shows our prosperity. This program here is simply going to be like a bill of fare; just according to the appetite in the various localities they will select what particular thing they want out of it. That is about the size of it. We wrangled here four years ago on that thing, and I don't believe it was hardly of any use. The comrades in the different places are doing very well. They respond; they are learning from time to time to respond to the conditions. And this is too much to endorse, and it does not work anyhow. I think that entire proposition is a waste of energy. Our Committee on Platform and Committee on Resolutions will attempt to treat of national affairs, and we are going to have state autonomy, and perhaps a little stronger than before; and the comrades in the different states, when we present this, they won't allow themselves to be dictated to except by the limitations of our general principles in the platforms as already laid down. Don't let down too many bars and make them jump too many hurdles. I believe in striking this whole thing out.

DEL. STEDMAN: Make a motion, then.

DEL. BERLYN: I make a motion to strike your whole program out.

Seconded by Lee and Simons.

THE CHAIRMAN: A motion is made and seconded not to concur with the recommendation. Any further discussion?

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): Comrade chairman and delegates, it appears to me from the limited discussion that has ensued on this proposition and the fight that was made in Indianapolis in 1901 and the fight that was made in this hall four years ago, that if a program including all that the political party can ask for, and that is national legislation, state legislation

and municipal legislation, shall be stricken out, we shall have the fight all over again. In other words, it seems that the fight for immediate demands is still on. We ought to have a program, and that program ought to include all legislative measures that the political party can possibly have in the nation, state, city, village or town. (Applause.) I therefore ask that the delegates vote that this committee stand, and that when the program is recommended it include everything that we fight for and not a part.

DEL. LEE (N. Y.): Comrade chairman, in seconding the motion to strike out this recommendation for a committee on general program I did not at all have in mind the doing away with any of what we call immediate demands, or a working program for the party. I took it that the party has reached that state in this country that it is to have and that everybody knows that it is to have a working program of immediate demands to fight for (applause), in its national campaigns, and in each of its state campaigns and in each of its city campaigns. But it seems to me—and it was with this in view that I seconded the motion of Comrade Berlyn—it seems to me it is impracticable, especially in view of the experience that we have met, that it is impracticable for a national convention to make municipal programs for the various municipal campaigns that are to be held. (Applause.) It seems to me it is impracticable even for a national convention to make state programs for the various state campaigns that are to be held. And as for our national campaign, I am of the opinion that we certainly should have a national program, and I am of the opinion that it should be—I do not say actually in one piece with the platform; it may very properly be made a program of demands appended to the platform, the platform being a declaration of principles; but even then, so separated as it should be, yet the whole must be a harmonious piece of work, and it should be the work of one committee, the Platform Committee, and for that reason I seconded the motion.

DEL. POPE (Mo.): I am in favor of the recommendation of the committee. It is true that we have ar-

rived at the place where we have a state and municipal program, and there is no better place for those ideas to be put forth than in this national convention so that we people, fighting the battles down in the cities and in the counties, can say to them, "We have a program, starting from the nation and going down to the city." (Applause.) Now, our first fight will not be at Washington City; it will not be at the state capitols in the states; but it will be in our small towns and in our cities, and we want a program so that we can say to our friends, "Here is what we propose to do." I am in favor of what the committee has recommended.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS (Ill.): I also seconded the motion of Comrade Berlyn, and I rise to speak in favor of striking out this committee. I do not think I can be accused of being in opposition to the formation of such a program. I was the man who made the original motion seven or eight years ago in the city of Indianapolis. I was the man who put on that program several months of very hard work, and who did more perhaps than any other one man, with the exception of Comrade Untermann, to get the program we have in actual form. I thoroughly believe we need to have something to say wherever we go into action, be it in the smallest village or be it in the nation, on whatsoever problems are up for consideration where working-class interests are at stake. But, recognizing that fact, I also recognize from experience and the hard work I put in on the national program, the absolutely impossibility of this National Convention, in a discussion participated in by two hundred delegates, outlining anything that would be of any possible benefit to a village in one place and a great city in another; to a mining community in the Gogebic iron country and a farming community in Texas; to a fishing village in New England and the great city of Chicago. (Applause.) And because I recognize the impossibility of hammering out properly the details that are necessary, I believe we ought not again to attempt that thing. I found it myself impossible. I relinquished it and other men took it up, and they found it impossible,

and I do not believe we ought to tackle that again in this convention.

DEL. HOEHN (Mo.): I am decidedly in favor of a working program. I am convinced that the time has passed when even the national convention can seriously oppose any working program or immediate demands. At the same time I hold that our national convention cannot prescribe municipal and state programs for every municipality and state in the country. It can only reach the nation. We make our national program, and it ought to be satisfactory. Then leave it to the various states and municipalities to draw up their own programs in conformity with it and to meet their various local needs.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): It is unnecessary for me to state where I stand on the question of immediate demands, and I am not going to make a long speech. We of course must have a program, particularly so in my part of the country where we take part in legislative work of the state; and particularly so in my home city which we may control next year or in two years. But for that very reason we do not want a committee on program. You in Seattle do not know about the needs of Milwaukee. We in Milwaukee do not want to interfere in the affairs of New York. I hope they have as bright men in New York as I am, and I know we have as bright men in Milwaukee as they have in New York. We must have a national platform, and it is our duty at this convention here to construct a national platform, a platform that will contain our national demands. We are here for that purpose. Wherever we have a state convention in any state we will formulate our state demands. At the local convention we will formulate our local demands. They all have to be in the same spirit, the same general socialistic spirit, which is international, but there we stop. I am in favor of striking out the committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favor of the motion to strike out the paragraph read by the chairman of the committee on rules, say aye; opposed no. The ayes have it.

The next section was read:

"16. A Committee on Farmers'

Program to be elected, to consist of seven members."

DEL. OSBORNE (Cal.): I move that we do not concur in the report.

Motion seconded.

DEL. ATWOOD (So. Dak.): In the eastern half of South Dakota, in the Red River Valley and in Kansas where I have been I have seen things that have made me think it is pretty near time that these Socialist mathematicians had figured out where they come in contact with the farmer, and figured it so that the farmer comes into the socialist movement as a class-conscious workingman. Today our western farmer has nothing. He is skinned by the capitalist class, and staggers under the same burdens as the other workingmen. The farmer's place is in the Socialist Party, and we will never get South Dakota until we get the farmer into the Socialist movement.

A DELEGATE: It is evident to my mind that all of us thoroughly understand that the farmer's place is in the socialist movement, just as the place of the workingman everywhere is in the Socialist Party. It is evident to my mind that when we issue an appeal to the workingmen in our national platform we include among them the farmer. I believe that the farmer understands it thoroughly, and if he does not, it is time he was waking up along those lines. To make a direct appeal to the miner or the printer or any other line of industry seems to me superfluous.

DEL. BROWER (Ill.): I want to see this committee stand. I have given considerable time to farm territory; and while it is true that it might seem superfluous for us to make a special appeal the wage-earner, whether he be printer, mechanic or blacksmith, it is different in the case of the farmer, a large class of whom are land owners today. These are called capitalists by a number of men now in the socialist movement, but we are coming to recognize them as wage slaves. I think there is plenty of work to be done by the special committee on the farmer. Let them report to this convention, and if we see fit to incorporate their reports in the report of the committee on platform, well and good. If we don't

want to take up their work, it won't take us long to put it away. I want to see this committee on the farmer get to work and see what they can bring into this proletarian convention.

DEL. FREEMAN (Ala.): I have been a farmer all the years of my life, a member of all the farmers' organizations in the South and now a member of the Farmers' Union, and I speak a great deal in my part of the country to farmers. Yet I come to you opposing the platform. As a convention of socialists here, representing the wage-earners of the world, the proletarian class, it is absolutely impossible for you to make a program that will fit the proletarian and fit the farmer. If I were put on that committee I would be at an absolute loss how to begin. How much more would this be true if you put on this committee men who never worked on a farm in their lives. I think I am in a position to thoroughly digest the matter, and I hope the proposed committee will not be elected.

DEL. RHODES (Texas): My Friends—I have belonged to the Farmers' Alliance, the Knights of Labor, the Agricultural Wheel, and the Farmers' Union. I have been identified with every labor movement we have had in Texas. The only trouble about this farmer proposition is that we have got two classes of farmers—one class that farms the soil and another class that farms him. Their interests, of course, are opposed. The class that farms the farmer—if you give him the prestige, sooner or later your whole movement will go to pieces. Now, to the point. I was making a speech the other day in Bonham, Texas. I had a delegation nearly half as many as you have in this house, and nearly every person in the house agreed with me in the proposition of collective ownership, but one man. He came to me afterwards and said: "I have been with you for years. I know no man whom I appreciate more than I do you. I am sorry to see you leaving us. (meaning the Populists). Now, I endorse every single plank you have got in the socialist platform save and except one, and that is the LAND plank." He could not agree with us on that plank, because he owned more

land in that town than any other man. He was perfectly willing to socialize everything else, if he were left untouched. The land proposition is a very critical thing for these people, and when you go out, without trying to discriminate between those two classes of farmers, you make a mistake. I take the position that every socialist who understands the position takes, that the farmer is the man who puts his hand to the plow, and not the man who farms the farmer. You will find one group of people who will say, "We endorse all the planks of your platform, if you will just leave out the railroads." Another group will say, "We will accept all your platform, if you will just leave out the docks," and another group will want the mines left out, and so on, until every plank of the platform is gone. We can't reach these people in that way. This movement is a workingman's movement, a proletarian movement, and I believe we should make our propaganda to the working people of this country, and forget that a man is a mechanic or a farmer or a stone-cutter or what he is.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): I am not a farmer, but I belong to a trades union. I am a proletarian. The average farmer is not a proletarian. Yet he is a producer. I belong to the working class movement—it is a movement that wants to win, a movement that wants to get control of this country. Now, I tell you, comrades, that you will never get control of the United States unless you have the farming class with you. The farmers do not even need to fight. If the farmers refuse to bring produce to the City of Chicago for six weeks, no matter whether we have control of Chicago or not, we are gone up. If the farmers of the country surrounding Milwaukee refuse to bring supplies to the city of Milwaukee for three weeks, no matter whether we control the city or not, by force of arms or any other way, we lose. We must get the farmers as a class. I have listened carefully to the delegate from Texas. With him I believe that we must get into very close touch with the farmers. Ours is a class movement, but it is built upon a

materialistic basis. We must deal with the farmer on that basis. In order to get the farmer you must give him something real. You must show him in what way the Socialist Party, in what way socialism, will benefit the farmer. If you cannot show him that socialism is going to benefit the farmer, the farmer has a right to stay away. Anybody who tells you that the proletariat of the city form the majority of the population of our country is mistaken. He has never studied the census. Now, comrades, this is a very great and grave question. We are not the only country that is discussing this. The farmer question has been discussed and agitated in Germany for the last sixteen years. They have had at the German congresses similar discussions to those at our conventions. They have had committees of very bright men. Some of the brightest socialists of the world have taken up this question. They have written many books on it, and they have not solved the question yet. They have tried to solve the question in France, by a guaranty to the small farmer that he would keep his land. I say this is a great question, which has been discussed all over the world, and which we must also discuss. And we more so than any other country because this country is before all things a farmers' country. Now, let us elect a committee. You don't have to adopt what the committee brings before you. You can listen to the report of the committee and if it doesn't suit you, you can reject it. But let us have a discussion. It isn't going to hurt us. We can learn something, at least.

DEL. EDWARDS (Okla.): I want to say to you that I live in one of the great farming states of the Union, in Oklahoma. Oklahoma is today one of the farthest advanced states in socialism. Out there the farmers are not asking for any special demands. I was speaking recently among the farmers in Missouri, and they are not asking for any special demands. What they need is to have the gospel spread before them. The principles and the program of socialism are enough for the farmers who are willing to investigate it, and I don't think they need anything special.

DEL. BARZEE (Oregon): I want to say to you, to begin with, that I am a farmer, but at the same time I want to speak from the proletarian standpoint. In my mind the question resolves itself into this: Is this a proletarian, workingman's movement or is it a populist middle-class movement? I say if the socialistic program is not good enough for the farmer, let him stand where he is till the capitalist gets him, boots and breeches.

DEL. BLOCK (Okla.): I am from Oklahoma, but lately from South Dakota, and I know a good deal about farming. I don't think we need make any special provision for the farmer more than anybody else, but I think there is a difference between the farmer and the regular ordinary wage-worker. He gets the same sauce served to him, but then he thinks he owns something. Now, we are not very definite as to what provision shall be made and what shall be done with the land that he owns, and what shall become of his team that he thinks he has got. I think it would be a very good idea to have a committee. We don't need to accept what they bring in if we don't like it. But I think we ought to make our position a little more clear upon this land question for the benefit of the farmer. We need him. And we know that he is not going to be deprived of the little home he owns.

The previous question was called for.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor of the previous question being put, please say aye; contrary, no. The ayes have it. The vote comes upon the motion that we do not concur in the recommendation of the committee to elect a committee on Farmers' program, on the farming question. All those in favor of the motion please say aye; opposed, no. The ayes seem to have it.

A division was called for, and a vote was taken by show of hands.

THE CHAIRMAN: All those who will raise their hands now will be in favor of not electing a committee on the farmers' program. All those in favor of striking out that clause, please raise their right hands. All those opposed to the motion to strike

out,—all those in favor of the Farmers' Program Committee—

Objection was made to that statement of the question.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair has been corrected, and has corrected itself. All those in favor of the election of such a committee raise your right hands.

The vote stood 101 for striking out; 81 for the election of the Committee. The motion to strike out was declared carried.

Credentials Committee.

DEL. SOLOMON (N. Y.): presented the following report:

Your Committee on Credentials met, with the following comrades present: Reilly, New Jersey; Untermann, Idaho; Clark, Texas; Berlyn, Illinois; Graham, Montana; Tuck, California; Solomon, New York; Boomer, Washington; and Gaylord, Wisconsin.

Clark of Texas was elected chairman, and Solomon secretary.

The Committee took up first the uncontested delegates, and ask to report as follows:

ALABAMA—Entitled to two delegates; credentials have been received for Thos. N. Freeman and F. X. Waldhorst.

ARKANSAS—Six delegates; credentials for Dan Hogan, E. W. Perlin, Wm. Penrose, J. Sam Jones, Wells Le Fevre and W. R. Snow.

ARIZONA—Two delegates; credentials received for Joseph D. Cannon and J. M. Morrison.

CALIFORNIA—Twelve delegates; credentials received for Wm. McDevitt, F. I. Wheat, G. W. Woodby, H. C. Tuck, Josephine R. Cole, Mary F. Merrill, J. B. Osborne, Cloudsley Johns, Harry M. McKee, Kasper Bauer, Bertha W. Starkweather; also an alternate in place of N. A. Richardson, who is unable to attend, the alternate is W. S. Bradford.

COLORADO—Four delegates; credentials received for T. L. Buie, Guy E. Miller, Mila Tupper Maynard, L. E. Floaten.

CONNECTICUT—Two delegates; credentials received from William Schieldge, Alfred W. Smith.

FLORIDA—One delegate, A. J. Pettigrew.

IDAHO—Three delegates; credentials received from Ernest Untermann, E. L. Rigg, John Chenoweth.

ILLINOIS — Fourteen delegates; credentials received from J. O. Bentall, Barney Berlyn, James H. Brower, John Collins, G. T. Fraenckel, Gertrude B. Hunt, S. A. Knopfngel, A. M. Lewis, Thos. J. Morgan, May Wood Simons, A. M. Simons, Seymour Stedman, John Walker; also from Comrade Charles H. Kerr, who is alternate for and has been seated instead of J. M. Patterson, who is in Europe.

INDIANA—Four delegates; credentials received from S. M. Reynolds, Robert Dunbar, and in place of Comrades Debs and Hallenberger the two alternates, F. G. Strickland and Otto Kunath have been seated temporarily until the regular delegates have arrived.

IOWA—Five delegates; credentials received from John E. Shank, Edward J. Rohrer, Margaret M. Brown, John M. Work, W. C. Hills.

KANSAS—Five delegates; credentials received from Benjamin F. Wilson, J. E. Snyder, A. S. McAllister, Ludwig E. Katterfeld, and Grace D. Brewer, as alternate, is seated in place of H. Rogers.

KENTUCKY—One delegate, Frank E. Seeds.

LOUISIANA—One delegate, Alexander Hymes.

MAINE—Two delegates; report has been received of the election of only one delegate, Willis E. Pelsey; there is no report about the other delegate.

MARYLAND—Two delegates; credentials received from H. Claude Lewis, William A. Toole.

MASSACHUSETTS — Ten delegates; credentials received from James F. Carey, Antoinette Konikow, Dan A. White, Eliot White, Patrick Mahoney, Squire E. Putney, George G. Cutting, Alva E. Fenton; alternates, in place of Franklin H. Wentworth, C. C. Hitchcock, and in place of Natti Laitala, Harriet D'Orsay.

MICHIGAN—Four delegates; Guy H. Lockwood, Etta Menton, Tom Hittunen; in place of A. M. Stirton, who will not be present, the committee recommends the seating of Dr. McMaster.

MINNESOTA—Ten delegates; credentials received from L. D. Rose, Thomas J. Peach, M. Kaplan, J. G. Maattala, Elias Thorsett, Ester Nieminen, James S. Ingalls, Guy Williams, Jules J. Anderson, John Macki.

MISSOURI—Seven delegates; credentials received from William L. Garver, G. A. Hoehn, William M. Brandt, Leander G. Pope, E. T. Behrens, P. H. Callery, Caleb Lipscomb.

MONTANA—Seven delegates; credentials received from James D. Graham, Ida Crouch Hazlett, Florence Wesleder, Gough H. Ambrose, John Bannell, Arthur Harvey in place of Del. John Powers, unable to attend, and the first available alternate, James Powers, is seated in place of James Proctor who cannot attend.

NEW HAMPSHIRE—Two delegates; credentials received for William H. Wilkins, and in place of Del. McFall is seated his alternate, Louis Arnstein.

NEW JERSEY—Six delegates; credentials received for Geo. H. Goebel, H. R. Kearns, W. B. Killingbeck, Fred Krafft, G. H. Strobell, James M. Reilly.

NEW YORK—Nineteen delegates; credentials received from Joseph Wanhope, Morris Hillquit, Algernon Lee, Thos. J. Lewis, Henry L. Sloboodin, Fred Paulitsch, Sol. Fieldman, Robert Hunter, U. Solomon, Benjamin Hanford, Julius Gerber, C. L. Furman, C. H. Vander Porten, John Spargo, W. E. Cole, Gustave Strebel, W. F. Fuhrman, August Klenke, Mark Peiser, in place of a delegate who is unable to be present, the committee recommends the seating of his alternate, Peter V. Cargill.

NORTH DAKOTA—Two delegates; credentials received for Arthur Bassett, and A. S. Anderson.

OHIO—This state is entitled to nine delegates. We have received report about the election of only seven delegates. The delegates reported on are Marguerite Prevey; Isaac Cowan, Robert Bandlow, Fred F. Vautrim, Ellis O. Jones, E. L. Rodgers, E. J. Zeigler. In place of Del. Rodgers, who cannot attend, his alternate, D. P. Farrell, is present, and is recommended to be seated.

OKLAHOMA—Twelve delegates; credentials received for John Hagel,

O. F. Branstetter, C. C. Ross, G. W. Davis, Winnie E. Branstetter, L. S. Edwards, C. H. Dome, Carrie C. Block, W. B. Reynolds, C. B. Boylan, J. G. Wills, Frank P. O'Hare.

OREGON—Five delegates; credentials received for F. C. Varner, R. R. Ryan, C. W. Barzee, Mrs. Mollie Crabtree, and B. F. Ramp.

PENNSYLVANIA—Thirteen delegates; credentials received from William Adams, Sam Clark, Joseph E. Cohen, George N. Cohen, Edwin H. Davies, Con F. Foley, Louis Goaziou, James H. Maurer, Edward Moore, Robert B. Ringler, John W. Slayton, Fred L. Schwartz, F. L. Tobias.

RHODE ISLAND—One delegate, Fred Hurst.

SOUTH DAKOTA—Credentials received for E. Francis Atwood, Freeman Knowles.

TENNESSEE—One delegate, Dr. Joseph E. Voss.

TEXAS—Nine delegates; credentials received from H. L. Holman, Alice McFadin, W. J. Bell, Stanley J. Clark, M. A. Smith, W. W. Buchanan, J. C. Rhodes, J. C. Thompson, Laura B. Payne.

UTAH—Two delegates; credentials received from Grant Syphers and Robert Leggett.

VERMONT—One delegate, Lawrence Albert Wilson.

WEST VIRGINIA—One delegate, H. W. Houston.

(We have received no report in regard to Houston, but National Secretary Barnes reports that he has been elected and we therefore recommend his seating, pending the arrival of his credentials.)

WYOMING—Three delegates; only two have been reported to us, H. V. Groesbeck and W. L. O'Neill.

MISSISSIPPI—One delegates. We have received no report and no credentials.

DELAWARE—One delegate, Frank A. Henck.

GEORGIA—One delegate, Max Wilke.

NEW MEXICO—One delegate, W. P. Metcalf.

NEVADA—One delegate, A. Grant Miller.

NORTH CAROLINA—One delegate, J. J. Quantz.

VIRGINIA—A. H. Dennett.

These are the uncontested delega-

tions. Now there are other delegates to be reported by this committee, with their recommendation, which cannot really be classified as contested delegations, because the committee considered the contest of such trivial nature as not to be entertained at all, but we have decided to include them in a separate report. The contest which I refer to is a contest signed by three comrades in the state of Nebraska, contesting the seats of Comrades Berger, Thompson and John M. Work on the ground that they are defendants on a charge which they are going to make at this convention for gross violation of the National Constitution. The committee was of the opinion that this is a matter which belongs to the states themselves, and did not entertain the contests at all, and recommends that the comrades mentioned be seated in this convention.

WISCONSIN—Ten delegates; credentials received for Winfield R. Gaylord, Frank J. Weber, E. H. Thomas, E. T. Melms, Victor L. Berger, W. A. Jacobs, Carl D. Thompson, Emil Seidel, Frederic Heath and Charles Sandburg.

The seats of Comrades Berger and Thompson were the only ones contested—the others were not contested—but the committee recommends that the entire delegation be seated.

The committee further desires to report that the seat of the delegate from Nebraska, G. C. Porter, has been contested, but the committee has decided to recommend the seating of the delegate pending the further investigation into the merits of the case.

The next case was the state of Washington. There has been correspondence filed with the national secretary from the provisional committee of the Socialist Party of the State of Washington. The committee did not go into the merits of the controversy, but recommends for the present the temporary seating of the delegates from the State of Washington, as follows: Emil Herman, Richard Krueger, John Downie, Alfred Wagenknecht, George E. Boomer, and E. J. Brown.

A protest has also been filed by J. B. Osborne of California against the seating of William McDevitt of California. The grounds of the protest

were a certain violation of Article 2, Section 2, of the National Constitution. The committee was of the opinion that the matter properly belonged to the State of California and has no place in the National Convention, and recommends that Comrade McDevitt be seated.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, comrades, you have heard, or ought to have heard, the report of the Committee on Credentials. It may be divided into three parts, the larger number being those uncontested, and among those I include the delegates from Wisconsin, because that is not a contest. Then there is a contest against Comrade McDevitt of California, which the committee recommends be overruled and the delegate seated. Then there are two delegations, the Nebraska and Washington delegations, with regard to which the committee is still considering the objections, and recommends that the delegations be seated temporarily. We will take up these three classes of credentials separately. What is your pleasure with those delegates whose seats are not contested? The recommendation is that they be seated?

DEL. INGALLS (Minn.): I move that the recommendation of the committee be concurred in. (Seconded.)

The recommendation was adopted.

THE CHAIRMAN: With reference to Delegate McDevitt of California, the Credentials Committee recommends that he be seated in spite of the protest, on the ground that the protest against him is a matter that should properly come before the local organization and not the National Convention. What is your pleasure with this recommendation?

DEL. KRAFFT (N. J.): I move and the delegate seated. (Seconded.)

DEL. OSBORNE (Cal.): The question is, shall a delegate be seated that the recommendation be accepted who belongs to a local and supports that local in an open violation of the National Constitution of the Socialist Party, Article II, Section 2, of the constitution? I would say upon that subject, comrade chairman and comrades of the convention, that the matter would have been settled by the State of California were it not for the fact that this particular local—

THE CHAIRMAN: Pardon me, comrade, I will have to rule you out of order. We cannot possibly entertain objections or charges against members here. Where there are two conflicting applicants, their credentials are in the hands of the Credentials Committee, and they will have to take the same course as the others. We are not concerned with any possible charges against that delegate. We have no jurisdiction.

DEL. OSBORNE: I will offer a substitute motion to the one pending before the house: that after all of the contests are settled this convention take up the question of the one pending.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have ruled that out of order.

DEL. OSBORNE: I appeal from the decision of the chair, on the ground that this convention has a right and it is its duty to enforce the constitution of the Socialist Party.

The appeal was put and the chair sustained.

THE CHAIRMAN: The recommendation of the committee is that Comrade McDevitt be seated. All in favor say aye; opposed, no. The ayes have it. And it is so ordered.

Now, in the case of Nebraska and Washington, protests have been made and are being considered by the Committee on Credentials, and the committee recommends that they be seated temporarily, pending the investigation of the objections. What is your pleasure?

Moved and seconded to concur in the recommendation of the committee. Carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your convention is now organized, comrades, and the first order of business will be the election of a permanent chairman for the rest of the day. There cannot be any business before the convention except this.

DEL. BROWN (Wash.): I move that you the temporary chairman be made the permanent chairman for the day. (Seconded.)

Carried unanimously.

DEL. HEATH (Wis.) was elected permanent secretary.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next order of business, before we proceed any further, will be to ratify the adop-

tion of so much of the proposed rules as we have before informally adopted. I will entertain a motion to that effect.

DEL. WORK (Iowa): I move that we adopt the action of the temporary organization in regard to rules, so far as we had proceeded. (Seconded.)

DEL. STEDMAN (Ill.): I move an amendment that the ratification be subject to that portion referring to the Farmers' Program. If this is seconded, I wish to speak on it. (Seconded.)

DEL. STEDMAN: I think that should be eliminated from this vote for the following reasons: So far as that proposition of the committee was discussed it was in more or less of a hap-hazard way. It is very true that one farmer vouched for the position of the farmers on the question in Oklahoma and another who knew just what the farmers wanted in Texas. The suggestion was made that we might drift into Populism. The danger from that, I take it, is hardly a considerable element.

We do, however, know this, that if a committee is appointed it might suggest no program—it might suggest a small one, or a considerable one. It might define or express the policy that this party might adopt to interest the farmers in the Socialist movement. With all due respect to the delegates from Oklahoma, with all due respect to those who are "up" on the farmers' needs and desires everywhere, I say that we have not at the present time the interest of the farmers as such in this movement.

I see no reason why we should dispose of that question in five or ten minutes' desultory talk. It is a question of considerable importance, not only to the Socialist movement of the United States, but of all other countries. If in other countries where the farmers are much less of a factor than they are here, they can devote days to the subject, we might find that it could benefit our movement to discuss it for at least half an hour. It cannot be disposed of by persons getting up and saying that they are farmers, and they know all about farming. It will do us no harm to discuss the question, especially where we recognize the importance of the subject to the movement, and especially when

electing a committee will not mean the adoption of any particular policy nor define our course of propaganda to the farmers. But it may assist in throwing some light upon the subject by and through which some of us who live in the cities may draw some information from those who live on the farms, and tell us why it is they were interested to such an extent that when it came to the question of nationalizing the grain elevators and docks they promoted and carried through a law, which law was, however, later declared unconstitutional. We do want a policy, a general policy, that will arrest their attention and consideration as farmers. There can be no harm in discussing the question and there may be considerable benefit to the movement, and not blindly shutting our eyes to a question that we may so easily be mistaken upon.

DEL. TOOLE (Md.): I am opposed to the farmers' plank of the program but I am in favor of this committee. I think it is of practical value to our movement. Anybody who has gone down among the farmers and tried to make a Socialist convert, must realize the importance of the subject. You go and tell the farmers that you are going to employ all the unemployed, etc., and they will ask you, "What are we going to do when you employ all the unemployed?" I am in favor of the committee. While I am opposed, on my present knowledge, to a farmers' plank, I am in favor of a committee that can give us some information on this farmer question. Some of our speakers go out into the country and tell the people we are not a farmers' party, we are a wageworkers' party. The farmer is not a wageworker. He is a property owner. He is a small capitalist. Another group of organizers go down into the country and they say: "You farmers are producers, you are capitalists." Now, I say that if we want to make an appeal to the farmer vote we want to know what we are going to say to the farmers, and why we say it. If we haven't anything to say to the farmers, then it is a waste of energy to send organizers down into those districts. If we haven't anything to say to the farmers, then let us give all our

energies to the cities. What are the facts about this farmer question? We do not know the facts. And that is why I am in favor of this committee.

DEL. O'HARE (Okla.): I speak both as a farmer and a Socialist agitator. I am in favor of a committee. I would be in favor of that committee being composed exclusively of farmers, meeting and conferring among themselves as to what matter they should bring before this convention, and then this convention should accept or reject their proposal.

Every day that I speak before the farmers, some farmer asks me to show him our platform and where it hits him; and there is not a solitary place in the platform, with the exception of that sentence where we propose a graduated land tax, that I can show him so as to help him to grasp our philosophy.

I am not in favor of any middle class proposals in our platform. I want, and all the Socialist farmers of Oklahoma want, revolution, and we want to have our Socialist farmers get together and pronounce "revolution" so the other farmers will know what they are talking about. Therefore, I hope the comrades will appoint this committee, bringing into it the brains from the ranks of the farmers who are Socialists, that they may bring before this convention a proposal that will express the requirements of the farmers.

DEL. SEIDEL (Wis.): The real question before this convention is whether we are going to elect a committee who shall study into this question of our relations to the farmer. I don't care whether you stand for or against the revolution. Those who are for the revolution ought first to be able to revolutionize their own minds. If you cannot offer the farmer anything it shows that you do not know how to handle the proposition. If I as a business man employ a traveling salesman and give him a good piece of goods to sell and he cannot sell it, he does not know his business. And I say if a man has a piece of goods like Socialism to offer to the people, and cannot make them adopt it, he does not understand his business, he don't know how to offer it to them. I want to say that there are many problems up before us today as a nation.

The question is whether the Socialists of America or the United States, assembled in convention here, can take them up and handle them. As far as the farmers are concerned, I want to say that I know that hundreds of them are raising fruit that is allowed to rot because they cannot find a market for it, and I know that hundreds of workmen in the cities are hungry for fruit and cannot get it. And the Socialists of the country in convention assembled say, "We have nothing to say in this matter." What do you think of that? You farmers perhaps have plenty of fruit in Oklahoma and Texas. We in Milwaukee haven't got it. Let us discuss this question. If you don't want to dispose of it today, or at this convention, you have at least shown that you have the courage to face it. Don't let us say, "Oh, I am too class-conscious to do it." I want to tell you, if you are phlegmatic you may easily be class-conscious; but if you want to be a real active militant Socialist and do something, then you have got to get down to hard work, and that is the secret of success in some of our cities.

Amendment carried. Original motion, as amended, carried.

DEL. SOLOMON: The Credential Committee makes a supplemental report to the effect that two fraternal delegates have presented credentials in behalf of the Socialist Party of Canada, the names of the fraternal delegates being A. W. Mance and E. A. Drury. The committee recommends that we seat the comrades as fraternal delegates on the platform, with a voice but not a vote.

Motion made and seconded that the report of the committee be adopted. Carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed further, to have the matter clear I will say that I will construe your former vote on the Stedman amendment to mean that a committee on a farmers program is to be elected. If I am wrong in my construction, please say so.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): I object to the construction of the chair, and raise a point of order against such a ruling.

THE CHAIRMAN: All those who are in favor of the construction given

by the chair to the previous vote, please say aye; contrary minded, no. The ayes have it. It is so ordered.

DEL. STEDMAN (reading report of Committee on Rules): No. 17: A Committee on Immigration shall be elected, to consist of five members.

DEL. BAUER (Cal.): I wish to move that that be stricken out. (Seconded.)

DEL. SPARGO (N. Y.): I rise to oppose the election of a Committee on Immigration, and I will state my reasons very briefly. I don't see how this body, in electing a committee on immigration, would be likely to select the comrades who could contribute any special light on the subject. I would call the attention of the delegates to the fact that anybody who has anything to say, any light to contribute on the subject of immigration, will be able to have a hearing before the Resolutions Committee, will be able to submit any resolution to that committee, and it will come up in the convention properly. Therefore it seems to me a waste of time to elect a committee on the immigration question.

Motion carried.

The next section was read:

"No. 18: A committee on the relation of foreign-speaking organizations shall be elected, to consist of five members."

Adopted.

The next section was read:

"No. 19. Discussion shall be limited to ten minutes for each speaker; no speaker shall speak a second time, until all who are desirous of using their time have spoken."

Adopted.

The next section was read:

"No. 20. Sessions of the convention shall begin at 9:30 a. m. and continue until 12 o'clock, and then from 1:30 p. m. to 6 p. m. Night sessions shall be held from 7:30 to 9:30, only when such sessions shall be provided for by motion during the day's proceedings."

Amended, fixing the hour from 10 to 12:30 and from 2 to 6. Adopted as amended.

The next section was read:

"No. 21. Roberts' Rules of Order shall be used, with the exception that when the previous question shall have been called for, two delegates on each side of the question shall be allowed

three minutes each for closing the debate before the question is put."

DEL. BERLYN (Ill.): I would amend it to read that the closer shall have five minutes, instead of three.

DEL. WORK (Iowa): I move to amend the section by adding "And with the further exception that no motion or proposition shall require more than a majority vote."

Both amendments carried. Section adopted as amended.

TELEGRAMS.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have a few telegrams which will take but a few minutes to read:

"Baltimore, Md., May 10, 1908. Socialist Convention,

Brand's Hall, Chicago, Ill.

May the result of the convention prove a beacon light for workingmen's emancipation.

Relief Society for Victims of Russian Revolution.

"Paterson, N. J., May 10, 1908.

Greetings from Local Passaic County. Wishing success in the great work for liberty."

"Philadelphia, Pa.

National Convention of the Workingmen's Circle, 15,000 members, sends fraternal greetings to the National Convention of the Socialist Party. The people want Socialism, and they will have it."

"New York, N. Y.

The Jewish Daily Vorwaerts sends hearty congratulations to the National Convention of the Socialist Party. The country is rallying 'round our banners. The mountain tops are reddening with the golden glow of the gathering dawn.

May your deliberations mark a great red-letter year in the history of the American people.

Abram Carhart,

Editor Jewish Daily Vorwaerts."

"New Jersey State Committee sends fraternal greetings. Keep cool and get there."

"Newark, N. J.

Greetings. Our choice—Debs and Haywood."

The convention then adjourned to Monday, May 11, 1908, at 10 a. m.

SECOND DAY'S SESSION

National Secretary Barnes called the convention to order at 10 o'clock a. m. and asked for nominations for chairman for the day.

Del. Carey, of Massachusetts, was elected.

DEL. MILLER (Colo.): I have a question of personal privilege and urgency. I have a communication to offer, and I desire to move its adoption.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection the chair will recognize it.

Del. Miller read the following telegram:

"Ernest Mills, Secretary Western Federation of Miners, 605 Railroad Building, Denver, Colorado: The Socialist Party in convention assembled sends greetings to the Western Federation of Miners. We congratulate you upon the splendid battle and final vindication of your organization. We condemn with you the use of Federal troops to destroy a labor organization as in Alaska. We are with you not only until Adams and the last of the victims of the acts of the Pinkertons are liberated, but until all the toilers walk out from the prison pens of poverty into the sunlight of economic freedom."

DEL. MILLER: I desire to move the sending of this telegram.

DEL. HILLQUIT (N. Y.): A point of information. I desire to know whether the Western Federation of Miners are in session now, or whether there is any particular urgency for this resolution or telegram.

DEL. MILLER (Colo.): I would just like to say that the Western Federation of Miners are not in session.

DEL. HILLQUIT: Now that I had my information, I move that this telegram and all other resolutions coming before this convention be referred to the Committee on Resolutions. (Seconded.) I do not believe

in offering resolutions out of the order as emergency measures and passing things without due and proper deliberation.

DEL. MILLER: I did not expect any opposition to this resolution. It seems to me this is a question of expediency, and the fact of the battle that the Federation is waging at the present time fully justifies the presentation of these resolutions as a special order of business. Perhaps you do not realize the blows that the Western Federation of Miners are meeting at the present time, the schemes that have been carried out against it. You are all acquainted with the dynamite firing up there at Telluride, and some of you people who may have used dynamite know that in their hands, in the way it is said to have been used out there in Telluride, it is manipulated by a mine manager. (Applause.) I would have the Socialist Party continue as it has been doing, throw down the gage of battle to those who are fighting the working class. It seems to me the urgency or the need of this is the effect upon the public mind that the action of this convention will have. (Applause.) I desire that we have the benefit of that. I did not suppose that there would be quite as many lukewarm friends of the Western Federation of Miners as I have found. That is all. I wish simply to say that I would like to see this resolution passed. Have you so completely forgotten the fact that the Western Federation of Miners has furnished you the best propaganda material that the Socialist Party has ever had? (Applause.) Do you realize the fact that an organization cannot hold the public stage for four years without putting into that propaganda the heart and the life of its members? Do you realize that that struggle has not yet

passed, simply because the men who are at the head of the organization were acquitted out there in Idaho? I want to say to you people that the eyes of the entire country were focused on Boise when Haywood was before the court. I am afraid that some times there is a little bit too much hero worship in the Socialist Party of this country. (Applause.) I was glad that you had your eyes on that case, but I don't want you to take them off the tragedy occurring in the Rocky Mountains now because the man who stands at the bar of the court happens to be a private in the great army of organized labor instead of one of the division commanders. (Applause.) I want you people to recognize the fact that the trial of Steve Adams is just as crucial, so far as the fate and fortunes of the Western Federation of Miners were concerned as they were when Haywood was on trial. (Applause.) I want you to recognize the fact that the Socialist Party may again have a battle, may again raise a cry for help, when all the voices of the cohorts of capitalism shall be silenced and an innocent member of the working class walk out to freedom and labor be again vindicated. (Applause.)

DEL. HILLQUIST (N. Y.): Comrades, just one minute. I want to appeal to the sobriety of this convention. I think I by no means feel less strongly on the subject brought up by Comrade Miller than Comrade Miller himself. I fully agree with every statement made by him, and am heartily in favor of the resolution, but I want to have some order and some system if we are to do business. We have plenty of points, comrades, which are of urgency. If every comrade will get up out of order, offer a resolution and make an agitation speech, we will not do the business for which we have come here. (Applause.) I claim we have a certain order of procedure. We have a Committee on Resolutions which will go over all the resolutions offered, consider them and report them with its recommendations, and the floor will then be open for full discussion. Otherwise one will get up with an open letter to Theodore Roosevelt, another with a telegram of congratulation, and we will have nothing but interruptions day after day,

hour after hour. Let us do business in a business-like way. (Applause.)

DEL. HOEHN (Mo.): Comrade Chairman, the Western Federation of Miners are not in convention at the present time, but I want to inform the delegates that the Western Federation of Miners are out on strike in Alaska and the Federal troops are in Alaska at the present time, and I believe this is a case of urgency, and for that reason I will support the resolution. I am in favor of voting on this matter now, and I do not believe that we should play politician here at this time on such an important matter.

The previous question was ordered. DEL. BAUER (Cal.): I rise to speak against the motion. I wish to say this to the delegates present: every time a matter has been brought up some one gets up and moves to refer it somewhere. Now, if we had taken a vote and acted upon the matter this thing would not have happened and taken up the last thirty minutes. It is the referring that causes all this trouble. Now, I say this is a matter of urgency and it would not take more than five minutes to dispose of it, but now those who indulge in the parliamentary tactics cause all this trouble.

DEL. HERMAN (Wash.): I speak for the motion. It is not a question whether this resolution should be adopted or not. It is a question whether we shall conform to the rules. I believe there is not a delegate in this hall but what is in favor of the adoption of that resolution, but we are here to do business and we are going to have a Resolutions Committee, and this matter is no more urgent than a great many other matters which are to come before this convention and will come before this convention. It is no more urgent than the resolution on trades unionism or other resolutions that will be presented, and I believe that in order to expedite matters we had better refer all these propositions to their regular committees so that we can do business in an orderly method and get through some time this summer.

DEL. BRANDT (Mo.): I am against the motion for one particular reason at least, that I have heard not less than three different speakers on this floor say they are in favor of it,

but they want to refer it, and if they are in favor of it let us vote right now and dispose of it and see if they are in favor.

DEL. SPARGO (N. Y.): I am in favor of the motion to refer to the committee, because I do not believe that any delegate from one reading of that telegram will know whether or not that is the most serviceable, the best and most effective kind of telegram that can be sent. I am in favor of the general principle involved if it were a resolution expressing sympathy and expressing support. But I am in favor of referring it. I am no friend of the mine owners and I am not in any spirit of antagonism toward the Western Federation of Miners; quite the contrary. My reason for desiring to have the telegram referred to a committee is that it may be considered carefully, phrase by phrase, sentence by sentence, so that we may know whether we have the best and most careful piece of work to send out that can be turned out by any committee. I have great respect for Comrade Miller's judgment usually. I admire Guy Miller as much as any man on the floor of this convention. He is my friend, faithful and just to me. Yet I am bound to say that I do not want to leave the entire matter to Guy Miller. I am not willing, if I am acting in an editorial capacity, to accept an article and submit to a reading of it on the part of the author. Let us have it done where we can talk it over, and if we think we can make it stronger and more effective as a piece of propaganda material, let us do so, and then let us come to the convention with a proposition that we are agreed on. We are not certain that we have got the best telegram to send out. That is my reason for desiring to refer. (Applause.)

The motion was put and carried, 93 in favor, 92 opposed.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RULES—(resumed).

The convention then resumed consideration of the report of the Committee on Rules, Del. Stedman reporting for the committee. The following references are to the sections as renumbered. The section renumbered 19 was read, as follows:

"19. During the sessions of the convention no smoking shall be allowed on the floor of the convention." Adopted.

Section 20 was read:

"20. Each delegation shall select one of its members to announce its vote." Adopted.

Section 21 was read:

"21. Each state delegation, in the absence of any regular delegate, shall designate the alternate who shall fill such vacancy." Adopted.

Section 22 was temporarily overlooked.

Section 23 was read:

"23. In case of a contest the delegates, both contesting and contested, shall not vote upon such contest." Adopted.

The next section was read:

"24. A delegate to the International Bureau shall be elected." Adopted.

Section 22, which had been passed, was then read:

"22. The National Secretary shall have a voice, but no vote." Adopted.

The next section was read:

"25. The nomination of president and vice-president shall be by a two-thirds vote of the delegates present."

DEL. WORK (Iowa): I move to strike out the whole section. (Seconded; carried.)

The next section was read:

"26. A Committee on Trades Unions, consisting of seven members, shall be elected, not more than one member to serve from each state."

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): Comrade Chairman, I think among two hundred delegates there will be at least one point of order inside of sixty seconds. Now, I have no desire to make any speech, but my state has adopted instructions on this particular question instructing our delegates from New Jersey to come here and oppose anything that will look toward any resolution either on craft unionism or industrial unionism; to come here and stand against any motion or act that looked to taking any specific stand or adopting any special resolution for any class, and

particularly in regard to this question of economic organization. And that is why I say that there should be at least some thought given to this subject. It is one of the most important questions, whether it comes up in this shape or in another shape, that this body has to deal with this week in Chicago. I am not in favor of appointing a committee. I am not in favor of taking any action whatever on this matter. I am in favor of making our appeal to the working class in the Socialist party platform.

DEL. MOORE (Pa.): The state of Pennsylvania on several occasions in its state conventions has declared that the working class movement in that state stands for the entire working class. So far as trade unionism is concerned, it is only a fraction of the working class. As certain things arise we will deal with them as they arise, but the trade union has no special significance in the Socialist movement, and we are instructed to vote that way.

DEL. MILLER (Nev.): In the state of Nevada we are not only in favor of unionism, but we have some very strong opinions concerning unionism. We have had experience with some forms of unionism, but notwithstanding that, we do not believe in the matter of the Socialist party taking any position on that subject. We believe that there should be no division in the party on this question, either for or against craft unionism. We do not believe that there is anything to be gained by it, and we do believe that the Socialist Party should take no position unless there is some distinct end to be gained. We are opposed to any pronouncement whatever, pro or con, upon this question or any other fad of any portion of society. Therefore I am compelled, in obedience to my constituency that I represent, to oppose any committee or any action of this convention upon any of these fads whatsoever. I believe in prohibition and a lot of other things, but I am not here to vote on any pronouncement of this convention upon any of them. I therefore, Mr. Chairman, move you that this rule be stricken out. (Seconded.)

DEL. POPE (Mo.): I want to

say that my profession is that of a lawyer, and I want to say that this trade union question is a Socialist question, too. I want to say that the Supreme Court of the United States has made a decision which, if it stands, will be equal in the labor movement to what the Dred Scott decision was in the slavery movement. (Applause.) And I want to say to you, speaking from that standpoint, that we want this committee; we want this committee to be appointed. We want the best brains of this organization to bring in a report on this question, and we want to discuss it, because I want to say to you that this labor union movement will not go down; you have got to fight the question out. You have got to begin now, and you have got to have a report, because, so certainly as I stand before you, the labor union movement is now standing on the brink waiting to see which way you will go. In the name of common sense and reason, we, the national party of the working class, are we not going to take a stand on this question and say that the trade union treasuries shall not be robbed by the capitalist class through the use of the Supreme Court of the United States? (Applause.)

DEL. JOSEPHINE R. COLE (Cal.): I would like to ask you, comrades and friends, if you think that you represent the working class better than the labor organizations? I would like to ask you if you think that a political party is going to carry on the economic fight. The economic fight will have to be carried on on the economic field. You are a political party. You only represent the Socialist movement in one direction. The Socialist movement must be represented on the economic field and on the political field as well. Now, comrades, I know as well as you do that craft unionism has its faults, and let me tell you that nobody knows it so well as the members of craft unionism, the intelligent members who are striving their best to bring the labor organization up where it should be, and who are looking to the Socialists for leadership. Let me tell you, comrades, right in our movement, right in our party, if we decline to help the trade union

movement there, there will be fewer Socialists than there are. Who is it that takes a stand against labor organizations? Are they working men? No. As a rule the men that take a stand against organizations are farmers. Those who take a stand against labor organizations, as a rule, are not working men. The trade union organization represents the working class and we, the Socialist Party, are here to represent the working class. I say to you that the Socialist Party of America is distinct from the International party, from all the Socialist parties of the world.

DEL. LEE (N. Y.): Comrade Chairman, it is not, I suppose, a question that we are going to decide at this minute whether or not we want to make a declaration in the name of the Socialist Party of the United States for craft unionism, or for what is called industrial unionism, or against one or the other. That is not the question that is before us this moment. My own opinion, and I believe it will be the opinion of the majority of the delegates, is that whether or not you shall make a declaration for or against either of those forms of industrialism, is a thing that we will yet have to decide in the debates of this convention. The question that is before us now is, are we going to take up the question of trade unionism here and see what we have to say about it, or are we going to decide that we will remain silent on the question of trade unionism at a moment when the whole capitalist press of the country, all the employers' organizations of the country and the courts of the country from police magistrate up to the Supreme Court of the United States are paying attention to the question of unionism. (Applause.) You cannot dodge this question, and if you could dodge this question, you ought not to. You cannot dodge it because after this convention we and our comrades in the party will be going out before the working men to speak for Socialism, and we know that among the working men of whom we speak, at least in the great cities and industrial centers, the greater part of the most active working men, the greater part of those to whom we can most easily appeal, are working men who are or-

ganized in unions of one sort or the other. We will go to them and we will have to say where the Socialist Party stands on the question of trade unionism, and we want to know where it stands; we want our speakers to know; and if we say to them, "Your trade unions are only a part of the working class, and therefore we Socialists have not thought it worth while to consider anything about trade unionism," what will they answer to us? They will answer to us, "Yes, in numbers we of the trade unions are only a part of the working class, but in numbers you of the Socialist Party are even a good deal smaller part of the working class." They will answer to us, "You Socialists claim that although your numbers are so few, yet you represent the ultimate interests of the working class. But we hold just the same that we whose numbers are greater may at least claim to represent the very important immediate interests of the working class." And if we are candid we will have to say that they are right. They do represent the interests of the working class upon the industrial field in the struggle from day to day. They do represent the interests of the working class upon the industrial field in the struggle from day to day. We do represent the interests of the working class, organized and unorganized, their ultimate interests upon the political field, upon that field which is half, the political half of the industrial movement. Our international conventions in the past, our international congresses in the past, without exception, have taken up this question and considered it an important one and have spoken upon it with clearness, with dignity, and I believe generally with wisdom. And if it has happened in one or two states that state conventions, as has been said here, have taken the opposite view and have said, "We are not going to pay any attention to trade unions," then I say it is high time that this national convention of the Socialist Party for the year 1908 should take a stand which will show those one or two states that they are mistaken on this subject. (Applause.)

DEL. IDA CROUCH HAZLETT (Mont.): I wish to speak in favor of

the trade unions, for it seems to me I have noticed already in the conferences of this organization a tendency, as one comrade said on the floor yesterday, to shirk the duty of the Socialist organization. We have shirked away from the Woman's Committee; let the women settle the question themselves, they say. We have apparently tried to shirk away from the Farmers' Committee; let the farmer work his way out, they say. And here I am surprised to see an evident attempt to shirk the question of the relation of the Socialist Party of America to the trade union movement.

Now, it seems to me, that this tendency on the part of our American with the trouble we have in various Socialist Party has a great deal to do states in appealing to the labor organizations. I noticed, I think in a recent number of the *International Review*, a statement that the American working man, that organized labor looks upon the Socialist Party almost with aversion. We find that in state after state, and in my travels, so far as I can see, I only find two states where that is not the case; one in Wisconsin and the other in Montana. Now, it seems to me that if we are to accomplish anything at all we have got to show ourselves as the political expression of the working class which fights its battles along the line of organized labor; and it seems to me of the utmost importance at this convention, when we find the courts against us, when we find their decisions heavily bearing upon trade union men and organized labor, as in Montana where we are suffering under the heaviest injunction ever issued from any Federal court, and the most sweeping injunction against the treasuries of the organizations as in England in the Taff Vale decision, the Socialist Party can only save itself as we have done, by coming to the rescue and fighting the battles of organized labor and letting the organs of the party go to work and get in the breach. It seems to me, if we wish to avoid the danger in England and several other countries, of organized labor slipping away from the revolutionary movement that claims to be a representative of the working class when it is not such and is not recognized as such, that we have not

only got to appoint a committee to handle the trade union situation fairly, but I think that we ought to do so and what is of vast importance, and what I myself am in favor of, is making a ringing declaration here in our platform or somewhere opposing the injunctions used by the capitalist class against us. (Applause.) Unless we do something of that sort it will be impossible for us to reach organized labor. We should really have their interests at heart instead of fighting them as we do in nearly every state in the union. In the large cities our Socialist speakers stand up and arraign the leaders in the labor organizations and call them all sorts of names and call them fakirs and all that, so what wonder that organized labor is indifferent to Socialism. Hence, I am in favor of a trade union committee, and a good strong one, composed of the best minds on this question. (Applause.)

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): Our party in Milwaukee is absolutely proletarian. We have the trades union movement with us in Milwaukee. I may say that above ninety per cent—ninety-five per cent probably—of our vote is a working class vote. We have only about two and a half lawyers in our ranks—not enough to fill the offices. But I tell you that we have got our hold on the working men in Milwaukee by preaching and organizing a labor movement with two arms—a political arm and an economic arm. We do not say that the economic movement—that the trade union—is of greater importance than the political movement—we do not claim that the political movement—the Socialist Party—is of greater importance than the trades union movement. We do not want to go into trades unions and tell them what they are to do; we do not do that in Milwaukee—but, on the other hand, we won't permit the trades unions to come over to the Socialist Party and dictate to us, as a party, what to do. We keep the two absolutely apart; but, nevertheless, we get every trades union man as such.

Whenever the trades unions have a fight on their hands in any way we support the trades unions loyally, and whenever we go to the ballot box—as a party—every trades union man

supports us loyally or he must explain why not.

We have the trades unions; we have the organized working class of Milwaukee with us. That part of the working class we do not have—the proletarians in Milwaukee which we are still to get—are the workingmen not yet organized, the foreign elements, the Poles and the Slavonians, the Italians, and so forth. These we do not get. And that is how the Democratic party won the election this spring. But the American working men, the men who are intelligent, the men who are organized, the men who study the situation and the needs of their class—the men that can read and think—those men we get.

I tell you, comrades, I can't go back to Milwaukee and tell them that the National Socialist Convention has even refused to appoint a committee to consider the trades unions and the trades union question.

I tell you that I know the international Socialist movement as well as anybody on the floor of this convention. I am probably as old a Socialist as anybody on the floor of this convention. I have probably done as much work for the movement as any one man on the floor of this convention. But I declare that if you decide here that you are not going to consider the trades union movement at all, that I am willing to do something decisive. I have been voting for other Socialist parties before—I may vote for a new Socialist party again. At the International Congress in Stuttgart, in Amsterdam, in Paris not only were the different Socialist parties represented, but also many trades unions. The trades unions are always represented at these international congresses. Are we not even to consider them here? It would be suicide to ignore them. Excuse me—my voice has given out and I must stop.

DEL. BERLYN (Ill.): This is the most remarkable thing I have ever heard. We are about to enter a political campaign with a party that is to throw aside its battle cries that in the past have gathered the working men around its banners.

We are called upon by some of the delegates here to ignore this trades union question. They say we should

ignore it. Now I want this committee for this reason. The question is this: Shall we follow the lead of the men who say they desire that this party shall declare to the world that the present class struggle is none of our business? That is the position taken by some of the delegates in this convention.

Where is this class struggle that we all talk about? Here among this body? Not by a long shot. The street car employees vote that they will strike. What right have we to go among them and sympathize with them, and ask them for their votes, and then say that the trades union question is none of our business? When we rolled up 47,000 votes in Cook County it was not because we said that the trades unions had nothing to do with us. The stock yards strike was on; and we were with the boys in their fight; and they rewarded us by electing two of our members to the legislature. But we didn't have the good sense of the boys in Milwaukee. We could not hold the ground that we had won because we had too many amongst us who said that the trades unions had nothing to do with us. That is the reason we lost ground. I tell you that you will make the mistake of your lives if you exclude this matter from your consideration. Are you going to talk about the Supreme Court decision in the boycott case? Are you going to talk about injunctions? Are you going to talk about sending the military to Douglas? Are you going to do that and then say that trades unions and trades unionism is none of your business? What are you going to talk about? Are you going to talk about the man in the moon? Are you going to talk about property rights? Or how to save the farmers? Are you going to tell the fellow who is hanging on by his eye brows how he may hold on with his teeth? Are you going to talk about that? I tell you you have got to make this fight. If the Socialist Party has any right to exist you have got to consider organized labor, in their fights against capitalism.

The members of the trades unions are the fellows who are doing the actual fighting now. Where are you

going to be? Are you for them or against them? Are you for the capitalists or against them? You must consider trades unionism.

DEL. TOOLE (Md.): We have the right to discuss this question, and we ought to discuss this question. And we are all agreed upon it if we look upon it in the right way. I think it is the wording of that resolution that causes all the trouble. Those men who favor industrial organization are opposed to the wording, "trades unions." Comrade Lee made the point that they do not want a resolution in favor of or against craft unionism or industrial unionism. What we want—what we all want, in fact—is a resolution in favor of organized labor. Is that right?

Now then, Mr. Chairman, with that in view I move to amend the resolution so as to substitute for the words "trades unions" the words "labor organizations."

SEVERAL DELEGATES: Second the motion.

DEL. CLARK (Texas): I came here to abide by the decision of this convention. I came here with the purpose of letting this convention settle these difficulties. And if the Milwaukee delegation has come with any other intention, or with any other idea in their minds than that, we would like to know it and know it now.

Milwaukee is here participating in a national convention of the Socialist Party, and the National Socialist Party is not participating in a Milwaukee convention. I repeat that we have come here ready to abide by the decision of this convention.

I am an industrialist. I am opposing the resolution to indorse trades unions, but understand, if this convention passes such a resolution I shall certainly abide by the decision of the convention; and I shall then go back home and support it. And I shall give all my time on the platform to propagating the principles set forth in our platform; because I am a Socialist and believe in abiding by the decision of this body in convention assembled.

But get this into your minds clearly, that if we shall have a political and an economic wing in this movement, that that economic wing should be

an exact expression of the industrial movement, and that we must control that movement politically.

If it is your idea and your intention to push a resolution in this convention in favor of craft organization it will be opposed as long as we can stand here and oppose it.

I wish to say that I appreciate the position of the delegates from both Pennsylvania and New Jersey. I expected to take some when I came here. I did not expect to get all that I advocate in this convention. But we do not intend to lie down and let them run through a trades union resolution in this convention without protesting as long as we can be heard. Understand, if you have a majority and decide for trades organization it will be over our protest, but we will obey the decision of this convention and be governed by this convention; and not be frightened by any threat of Milwaukee delegates to bolt this convention. If the Milwaukee delegation have the idea that they will bolt I suppose there is room in the Populist band wagon—since the Socialist movement in America does not altogether revolve around the Milwaukee organization. The thing for us to consider is this: if we are to pass a resolution in this convention relative to the organized labor movement of this country let it be sweeping so that it will include every labor organization in America. Then I can go back to my constituency; I can take my place on the platform; I can tell the member of the Industrial Workers of the World; I can tell every member of the Farmers' Union, and every state organization in America that we have declared for organized labor in this convention, and that will satisfy them, and that will satisfy every fair-minded man in this convention. And any other man certainly wants to bolt this convention.

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): I am very much interested in watching this cyclone coming from the Western and Southwestern states and passing through this convention. Do you know what it means? It means, getting rid of all verbiage and all the oratory, this breath of the new Socialist zeal from the Western prairies means the repudiation of Karl Marx;

and you ought to take his picture down. It means the repudiation of the authority not alone of Karl Marx, but the authority of every International convention that has ever been held connected with Socialism, and it means the repudiation of all the declarations that have ever been made by every Socialist convention, including the last one in this hall four years ago, and it means, reduced to its essence, impossibility again, instead of Socialism.

The previous question was ordered.

DEL. FARRELL (Ohio): I wish to speak in favor of the amendment. There are comrades who have taken the floor who have expressed my opinion. Others will take the floor who will not express my opinion. I believe this matter will go through and that this amendment will be adopted. I hope it will.

It has been said here by some that organized labor should not be considered by the Socialist party, but at the present time I believe that will be a mistake.

Four years ago I was instructed to support a position in the convention in opposition to the recognition of organized labor. When the roll-call was taken on that matter it was 107 in favor of the resolution, in favor of the trades union movement, and 42 against. I registered my vote against it, but I am here to say that within the last four years the development of the class struggle in the economic field has convinced me that it is necessary for this organization in convention assembled to express itself by voting its best wishes to the organized labor movement.

In the last ten days I have had a warm discussion with a high official of one of the building trades organizations on this political question, the trades union movement, and I made the statement to him that in my opinion seventy-five per cent of organized labor in America is ready for political action, and it is my opinion today that this convention could do nothing better than to appeal to organized labor in America to take political action in harmony with the Socialist movement.

I want to say that the labor organizations are coming to a point where

they will be forced to take this action, and we want a ringing appeal to organized labor to recognize that fact. I want to say you have more to expect from the two and a half millions of organized workers of this country than you have from the sixteen or eighteen millions of the unorganized in pushing your propaganda.

That is the point to be looked at and considered now. Your organized Socialist movement with its fifty thousand members is doing a lot more than the four hundred or five hundred thousand who are not organized. If you organize the labor movement in America regardless of its trade, crafts or industrial organization, if they can be lined up in a harmonious movement, in sympathy with our political movement, it is going to be an immense factor in our future success.

DEL. CANNON (Arizona): I wish to speak in favor of the appointment of the committee. We have been told that this is one of the most important questions that is coming before this convention, and the very delegation which tells us that, tells us that we should ignore the most important question that is coming before us. I am surprised that a delegation should come in here and tell us that we should not take any action on the trades union question, where in his own State of Nevada a scab union has been trying to break up the Western Federation of Miners, and where in Goldfield one union is struggling for its life and another union with a charter from the Federation tries to strangle it.

I want to go on record, and the delegates from Nevada will see that it does go on record. We have a delegation from New Jersey that tells us that this question is very important and then says we ought to ignore it. That is what New Jersey demands, and they come from the home of almost every giant trust in the United States, and then tell us that there should be nothing done for the trades unions.

There are two kinds of unionism, and both of them cannot be right. There are two forms of unionism—one is class unionism and the other is craft unionism.

We are talking about the class

struggle. Let us put it in practice. Let us endorse the class form of unionism. Let us point out to the American wageworker how he can better the conditions under which he suffers.

We condemn in our political platform Sam Gompers for telling the workmen to keep out of politics and then propose to keep this Socialist convention from going into the union question, which is identically Sam Gompers' and deserves no more credit than does his stand.

Fellow delegates, we have got to take one side or the other on this question. I do not believe that this convention is going to be too cowardly to take sides.

As to the wording of the rules that have been read to you, I am not going to dispute about that now. But I do want a committee appointed and I want to see the committee prepare a report here, and when the committee brings in its report you will fight it out on the floor of this convention.

I am in favor of having the committee appointed, but if there are State delegations which are afraid to go on record I want to go on record for Arizona. We are not afraid to go on record.

Because you are told that the question is important is no reason why you should ignore it. If it is important you should discuss it and take a stand on it, and it is an important question. Let us discuss it and let us take a stand on it.

DEL. JOS. E. COHEN (Pa.): As I understand it, we are here for the purpose of legislating that which we believe will be for the best interests of the working class of America at this particular time. We are not here for the purpose of being influenced by threats of bolts by one arm of the labor movement, or threats from any place.

We are not here for the purpose of discussing the condition of the Socialist movement in Germany, nor do we desire to make our party a second edition of the S. L. P. The Socialist Party of Pennsylvania at every convention has recognized the power of the injunction and has been against it. It has always resolved in favor of the working class in whatever

particular struggle they were engaged, whether it was in Colorado or the striking car men down in Chester.

The position of the Socialist Party is that the trades unionist—and I am one among them—are not a privileged element in the working class of America, nor is any other class. It is true that we can control them better than we can unorganized labor, but they are not a privileged element in the working class.

It seems to us that if you want a resolution you can have it, but that it is not necessary to elect a special committee to bring in a special report for a special section of the working class. It seems to me that you can just as well pass a resolution if you want to without having a resolution that will be brought in by people who are in favor of one kind of unionism as against another.

Comrade Lee has said that we want a resolution that will be neither in favor of nor opposed to any particular kind of union. Have you got such a resolution now? Comrade Lee thinks so.

But I can give you the evidence of an alternate of New York who does not think so, but who thinks that the present resolution is for the purpose of obscuring the issue and appealing to the craft unionists as against the industrial unionists.

If we want a resolution for organized labor, I don't think there is one man from Pennsylvania who will vote against it, provided it goes in as a resolution for organized labor, providing it recognizes the struggles of organized labor and not merely an appeal for votes so that members in Illinois or in Milwaukee, or somewhere else, can go out and say, "Look here, you vote for us, because we are in favor of you."

DEL. OSBORNE (Cal.): I am opposed to the appointment of a committee on trades unions. I think the committee getting up the order of business favored the establishment of too many committees. We might as well have a committee on lawyers. I think the Socialist Party has always stated its position on trades union matters. The Socialist Party of the Pacific coast, a great many of its members at least, have opinions on

this question, and the delegates from California even offered a resolution on this question, expressing their views that they think ought to have gone to the committee on platform.

I want to say another thing. Since it has been charged here that the Pacific coast people, the farmers of the Rocky Mountain states and so on, forget so many of the doctrines and so much of the philosophy of Marx, and it is called new Socialism, I want to say that there are some of us on the Pacific coast who have been members of the Socialist Party since 1891, and we have certain views about the class struggle, and one of our positions on the class struggle is this: That a contest as to whether a workman is going to receive a dollar and a half or a dollar and sixty cents a day is no part of the class struggle.

A DELEGATE: That is all you know about it.

DEL. OSBORNE: Our conception of the class struggle is not a struggle as to commodity organization. Our position is that the working class is engaged in a revolutionary struggle in the political field. Our position is that the class struggle is a struggle by the capitalist organization to hold its political power. And nothing short of that rises to the dignity of a class struggle.

As to the Socialist movement, so far as our Pacific coast and Rocky Mountain states are concerned, my position is that while we have not so large a per cent of membership as other sections of the United States, yet that we have the most active body in the party that is to be found in the United States.

It looks to us that this is not a practical thing in the Socialist movement. Our position is that we are ready to go on record as favoring organizations of labor, in their economic struggle, whatever it may be. But at the same time we believe it our duty to work for the industrial form of unionism as best suited to develop that solidarity in the working class that is necessary to success.

Amendment carried. Motion as amended carried.

DEL. HAGEL (Okla.): I want to ask for the election of a committee

of five to consider the attitude of the Socialist Party to the commission form of government in municipalities. And I now make the motion that we elect a committee of five to examine into and report on this question. (Seconded.)

DEL. HAGEL (Okla.): The commission form of government is something that has arisen in Oklahoma. There are about twenty towns that want to adopt it. So far the Socialist Party has no official declaration of its attitude in that matter, and it is for that reason that I ask for the election of this committee so that we may know what should be the stand of the Socialist Party nationally, as well as within the different states on this question. The commission form of government is for this purpose. It is to do away with the election of officials by the various parties, and it is to be a non-partisan form of government by non-partisan officials. For that reason the delegates from Oklahoma ask for the election of a committee, so as to investigate whether it is advisable for the Socialist Party there to oppose or help along in the formation of these commission forms of government. I will add that I know hardly anything about it because we have not had it yet. But they are trying to force it upon us.

Motion carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: A question is now on the adoption of the rules as a whole. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. HILLS (Iowa): There is one rule that ought to be killed. I think we have had enough of delegations nominating their favorite son without first finding out whether he will accept. I think it nonsense for us to take the time of this convention in trying to nominate and elect committeemen who do not want to serve. So I think it ought to be the sense of this convention that no comrade here should make any nomination unless he has first got the consent of the one nominated and his promise to serve if elected. I think that ought to be the rule. (Seconded.) Carried.

The rules as a whole were adopted as amended.

Adjourned.

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Convention was called to order at 2 p. m.

THE CHAIRMAN: The first business will be the supplemental report of the Committee on Credentials. Comrade Solomon will read the report for the Committee.

DEL. SOLOMON: The Committee on Credentials reports the seating of Comrade J. S. Lampman, as alternate, in place of J. S. Bassett of North Dakota.

With reference to the Washington contested delegation, the Committee makes the following report:

MAJORITY REPORT ON WASHINGTON CASE.

Whereas, the Provisional Committee of the Socialist Party in Washington present no delegates to be seated in this convention, and inasmuch as the matter of their recognition as a Socialist organization is still to be passed upon by the National Executive Committee, this Committee does not consider that it has any jurisdiction in the matter and can only recommend that these delegates who have presented proper credentials be seated.

We further recommend that the National Executive Committee be called upon to take up the matter at once and report its findings and recommendations to the national convention.

In the matter of the Nebraska controversy the Committee reports the seating of Comrade G. C. Porter, and recommends in the case of Comrade Porter that he be seated permanently as he was seated temporarily yesterday. The reason for this is that we do not consider it is within the province of the Committee on Credentials to pass on the acts of the National Executive Committee, they having already passed on the matter prior to our meeting.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection we will take up the report of the Credentials Committee serially.

DEL. REILLY (N. J.): I am a member of that Committee, and have a minority report. A minority of the committee desires to make a minority report. I have placed in the hands of your secretary a copy of the minority report which I wish to have read to this convention.

THE SECRETARY: There are two minority reports.

DEL. REILLY: This is the minority report on the Washington contest. This minority agrees with the committee in all its recommendations, except one particular phase of the Washington contest. I will read the report and it will make our disagreements clear to you.

The minority report was read, differing from the majority report in that it did not favor referring to National Executive Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any other minority reports?

ASST. SEC. STRICKLAND: The report signed by H. C. Tuck and Geo. E. Boomer is the next one. I will read it.

MINORITY REPORT ON NEBRASKA CASE.

We, the undersigned members of the Committee on Credentials, dissent from the decision of the majority in recommending the seating of G. C. Porter as delegate from Nebraska and refusing to consider the claims of the contestants on their merits, for the following reasons:

1. It appears from the evidence that the National Executive Committee has overridden the rights of the state organization by declaring Nebraska unorganized when there were sixteen locals in good standing

2. It appears from the evidence that G. C. Porter is an expelled member of the Socialist Party, having been expelled from his local.

We therefore recommend that the case of Nebraska be heard upon its merits by this convention.

H. C. Tuck.

Geo. E. Boomer.

DEL. TUCK (Cal.): I am one of the protesters. I move a substitute amendment that the minority report be accepted.

DEL. WILLIAMS (Minn.): Does it appear from the minority report that G. C. Porter is not a dues-paying member?

DEL. SOLOMON: I desire to state that there has been no evidence whatever presented to show that Comrade Porter is not a member in good standing in the party today. There has been a rumor given out by the contestants that it may be so, and that Comrade Porter has been expelled from the party, although the comrades who made that statement are not members of the party themselves.

DEL. ROSS (Okla.): I want to ask would it not be well before action is taken on that minority report to have our comrade Secretary Barnes inform us whether Comrade Porter is not a member at large.

DEL. TUCK: The information has been asked in regard to Porter. The secretary of the Credentials Committee, Comrade Solomon, has stated that there was no evidence before the Committee to support the statement that he has been expelled from his local. I wish to deny the statement of the secretary. Comrade Spence, who had a paid-up membership card in the State of Nebraska, a member at large, appeared and gave testimony before that committee and declared his willingness to make oath that he attended the meeting of the local in which Mr. Porter was a member, and was present at the time the action was taken expelling him. Mr. Porter was present and was asked in regard to the matter. He admitted that charges had been preferred against him, that he had been notified, but had declined to appear before the local and preferred to come to Chicago. Those are the facts as I heard them, and my hearing is good.

DEL. CLARK (Texas): I would say for the information of the delegates here that we have unmistakable evidence, through our secretary, Comrade Barnes, that Porter is a dues paying member of the Socialist Party from the State of Nebraska. If Porter has been turned out of the party it has been since he left Nebraska. No evidence has reached this convention or this committee that he has been turned out, except from the faction that is contesting his seat. There has been no letter received by the National Secretary in regard to it. The question is as to whether or not we should consider the action of the National Executive Committee which declares the Nebraska movement unorganized, as conclusive, or whether we should report that we have nothing whatever to do with it, and seat the delegate, Comrade Porter, who stands as a regular dues-paying member of the Party. To make it clear, the National Executive Committee declared the Nebraska movement unorganized and requested all of them to begin paying dues to the National Secretary. It seems that the Porter faction availed themselves of that decision and began paying dues to the National Secretary. The other faction did not do so, but kept aloof on the ground that the National Executive Committee had overridden the constitution of the Party in declaring the Nebraska movement unorganized. It was not a matter for this Committee to say whether the National Executive Committee had done the right thing or not. All we could do was to pass upon the evidence before us as to the accredited delegates from Nebraska, and we have done this.

DEL. BOOMER (Wash.): I want to say a few words particularly to uphold the minority report which I signed—also to plead with some of my comrades here for some show of fairness. If a member of a committee tries to do his duty according to the evidence that is submitted, it is absolutely unfair for a delegate to say that he tried to do crooked work and could not. I say again that we had no knowledge whatever from Secretary Barnes or anybody else, that Comrade Porter was in good standing. We heard rumors to the

effect that he might be a member at large. We did have evidence submitted by members of the Party in good standing that Mr. Porter had been expelled by his own faction and his own local, after having been notified of charges and failing to appear. I signed that report on that one ground only, and I stand on the ground that when a member of the Party has been expelled we cannot in justice to ourselves recognize as a delegate on this floor, an expelled member of the Party.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair can perhaps secure for you that information. It seems to be a question as to whether Comrade Barnes did say or did not say that this delegate in question was a member in good standing or not. I want to ask if National Secretary Barnes is in the building. The difficulty is that we are arguing on a statement purporting to have been made by the National Secretary.

DEL. TUCK: I deny it. He made no such statement as to Barnes. He said nothing to me whatever.

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): If you will just listen I think you will get this straight in about half a minute. The National Executive Committee, owing to the state of confusion in Nebraska, declared the state to be unorganized. Under those circumstances there was only one way for a delegate to be elected to this convention, viz., by a referendum conducted under the auspices and direction of the national office. That election was so concluded. Comrade Barnes placed in the hands of the Credentials Committee a credential properly signed by himself as national secretary, certifying Comrade G. C. Porter as delegate elected by the referendum of the comrades of Nebraska. The vote I think was something like 60 to 15. I don't remember just exactly, but at any rate that is immaterial. Now then, on Friday last, in that unorganized condition, with the controversy existing, knowing that Comrade Porter was on his way or about to make his way to Chicago, some comrades in Omaha who were members of the same faction, brought charges against him on grounds that do not bear at all on his personal character or his standing in the Party, and at a meeting of his

local introduced a motion to expel him from the Party. He had been notified, but had already made arrangements to be in Chicago. He did not think they were justified in bringing charges or expelling him without a fair trial, so he came on to Chicago. The Credentials Committee believed that he was justified in coming here with his credentials, and we have recommended that he be seated because he was elected by a referendum of the Party, properly taken, and whatever expulsion there was was simply a part of the controversy that was in progress there and simply for the purpose of unseating him at this convention and for no other purpose whatever.

DEL. SCHWARTZ (Pa.): I rise to a point of information. I am a member of the Credentials Committee and I would like to ask the Credentials Committee when they held this meeting to listen to this case in Nebraska. I was not invited to the meeting.

THE CHAIRMAN: The delegate is not in order. Whatever he has to say to the Credentials Committee should be said to them, by him. The National Secretary is present, and it is well for him at this time, as his name has been brought into this discussion from the floor.

NAT. SEC. BARNES: Regarding the delegate from Nebraska and his election the referendum for the same was conducted under the direction of the National organization. In agreement with the National Executive Committee, the National Committee concurred in the withdrawal of the charter of the Nebraska state organization, at the December session of the National Executive Committee. Since that time a number of locals comprising many more members than were represented in the former organization, have attached themselves to the national organization, as locals directly attached. The referendum was conducted from the national office and Comrade Porter received an overwhelming majority, all comrades voting who are attached through their locals to the national organization. Comrade Porter is a good standing member of the National Party, according to the action taken by the National Executive Committee and the National Committee. I did not hear any of the discussion.

I do not know whether there are other points that you desire to have presented. I am prepared to answer any other questions.

DEL. CHENOWETH (Idaho): I would like to ask Secretary Barnes how it is possible for a local to be organized in the State of Nebraska when there is no State organization, and if that is true, how can a local expel Comrade Porter from the organization if he is directly attached to the national organization? How can this minority of the Committee on Credentials bring in such a report as that presented here?

NAT. SEC. BARNES: A number of locals have been chartered by the National Executive Committee, since the action taken in December, consequently there are a number of locals properly organized.

DEL. TUCK: Upon what constitutional grounds did the National Executive Committee in December take away the charter from the state organization of Nebraska? I am rising to a point of information.

NAT. SEC. BARNES: I think that is entirely true; and also that the National Executive Committee is capable of answering for its own acts. I think it ought not to devolve upon me to give the reasons for what they have done.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): I want to ask the Secretary whether he has signed the credentials of Comrade Porter?

NAT. SEC. BARNES: I have. I have signed Comrade Porter's credentials, as I have signed the credentials of all delegates from unorganized states.

DEL. BERGER: And the election was conducted by the regular referendum vote?

NAT. SEC. BARNES: As regular as the national office ever conducts, and that is regular. I want to make a statement to the Committee on Credentials, that after they left the national office this morning a letter came from Local Omaha addressed to them, and a copy of it to me, saying that Comrade Porter was expelled or suspended the other evening. This they have not received as an official communication, but it will be here this afternoon.

DEL. ROSS (Okla.): A point of information that I want the convention to have, as well as to have myself so as to act intelligently. I want to get it direct from Secretary Barnes. Comrade Barnes, as the National Secretary, has issued charters to locals in Nebraska as an unorganized state; that unorganized membership, as far as the state is concerned, has elected by a majority a comrade as a delegate. It has been called in question as to whether he was a member of the Party or not, and this information I want Comrade Barnes to give. If he is a member of the Party, I, as a Party man, will stand by him.

NAT. SEC. BARNES: Porter is a member in good standing, having his due book, which I have seen, showing his dues all paid up.

DEL. OSBORNE (Cal.): I desire some information. Before I can vote intelligently on this question I desire this information. Secretary Barnes declines to give the information. Therefore I make a motion to invite Comrade Work or Comrade Gaylord to give us the information, that is, on what ground did the National Executive Committee revoke the charter of Nebraska?

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair will make a statement which I trust you will listen to. We have called upon the Secretary to give such information as he possesses. If he has exhausted his fund of information then we will pass him over, and take up the National Executive Committee. The Convention will be in order. Is there any other question to be asked of the National Secretary?

DEL. THOMPSON (Wis.): I want to ask Secretary Barnes this question. It has already been stated that Comrade Porter is a member in good standing. I want to ask whether these men who are contesting Porter's place, whether they are members in good standing or not?

NAT. SEC. BARNES: Every person in Nebraska, who had been affiliated with the party, including the persons in question, were repeatedly solicited to attach themselves to the national organization under the ruling of the several committees. These persons have held aloof and are not affiliated with the national organization.

DEL. UNTERMANN (Idaho): About the letter received this morning, what names were attached to that letter? What side did it come from, the statement that Porter was expelled? Were they members of the Party?

NAT. SEC. BARNES: It is signed by the secretary of the local that is affiliated, Local Omaha. I cannot remember the name of the secretary who signed it; possibly somebody can help me out.

A DELEGATE: Martell?

NAT. SEC. BARNES: Martell; that is the name.

A DELEGATE: I am a member of the Credentials Committee and I wish to state that I am in favor of the majority report. Whether Porter was a member in good standing or not seems to resolve itself down to a question of veracity. Shall we believe Barnes or shall we believe the contesting delegation, that have no proofs at all to offer in support of their statement, except their own assertion. On the other hand, Comrade Barnes is authority for the statement that Porter is a member in good standing and the others were not. Now they tell us that these people were given every opportunity to avail themselves of the situation, to enter the national organization by becoming a part of the national organization, and this they refused to do. And they come here now to fight for it. They talk about fair play. They don't want fair play. We have given them every opportunity to get fair play; and for that reason I am in favor of the majority report.

A DELEGATE: Has Comrade Porter of Nebraska been granted a membership-at-large card during the past week?

NAT. SEC. BARNES: Not to my knowledge, and I would know.

A DELEGATE: What is the date of the letter from the secretary of the Omaha local stating that Porter was expelled; what is the date of that letter?

NAT. SEC. BARNES: I think it was dated Saturday.

A DELEGATE: Does it give the date of his expulsion?

NAT. SEC. BARNES: No; according to my recollection it runs like

this: "This is to inform you that Comrade Porter has been expelled, and you may ask for all further information that you desire on the subject." Giving no information. That is about the substance of it.

A DELEGATE: Is it a fact that Local Omaha was expelled from membership by the State Committee of Nebraska in January, 1907?

NAT. SEC. BARNES: It was reported that they were expelled. They mutually expelled each other. That is the point.

Question put. Minority report rejected. Majority report adopted.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the majority and minority reports relating to the State of Washington. The question comes upon the motion to substitute the minority report for the majority.

DEL. WORK (Iowa): I am a member of the "despotic" National Executive Committee, and I know that we cannot take up this matter and discuss it before the convention adjourns. The members of the National Executive Committee, with the exception of one, are delegates to the convention and we have convention business and convention committees to attend. This matter will take a lot of time. I think the two members of the Credentials Committee who signed the minority report have the right idea of the subject,—but I would add that the delegates take their seats in the convention and let the matter be disposed of after the convention, after the Washington comrades have sent in their request in the proper manner for a referendum vote in that State.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): Now, Mr. Chairman and Comrades, I think I have an intelligent reason for opposing this motion. As a national organizer I have been twice to the State of Washington. I have no interest whatever in either side of this controversy, but I, like the rest of you, have a great interest in the Socialist cause and the spread of Socialist principles. I stand here—and I know what will be the consequences of standing here, in my work as organizer, from those whom I oppose, and yet I stand here and put on record my candid judgment that the Socialist movement in Washing-

ton has been paralyzed by the action of those who call themselves Socialists. I stand here and say that as organizer I found my work interfered with repeatedly by those who were supposed to be the organization. I worked like a dog to overcome the consequences of the action of those who called themselves Socialists. The State Committee arranged my route, and three days later I saw letters written by those same people knocking me and urging that they insist that I be taken out of the state. Under such circumstances, something is wrong. Why should we not deal with the matter now? I know the obstructionists up there, and their one purpose is delay. Let us deal with the matter right now and get the Socialist movement in Washington in shape to go forward in this presidential campaign. Let us put the "leaders" of both sides in the hole, and get down to the rank and file. Why should we defer? Right here in Chicago we have the representatives of both sides. On the one side we have the ablest men they have, with the exception of Titus. They can state their side; the committee can hear them. On the other hand we have Hutcherson, the leader on the other side, a man that has sacrificed a great deal for the Socialist movement—he can talk for that side.

If you leave it to the National Executive Committee to deal with after the convention, there will be a mass of correspondence and a great deal of necessary delay. The next thing you know the presidential campaign is upon us, and matters not being settled our work will not go forward in Washington as it ought. The rank and file on both sides feel that both sides ought to agree to immediate action. We don't know which side is right, but we do know there is wrong on both sides. I suggest, therefore, that being the case, that we declare Washington unorganized, so that the national secretary can ask of the rank and file of Washington to say who they really want, whether it is the Titus crowd or the other crowd, and let it be decided so that in one month or six weeks we will have everything going along in a straight line.

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): There is a very logical reason why as a mem-

ber of the credentials committee I support this recommendation of the committee: Comrade Hutcherson came before the committee; we said, "What evidence have you?" He said, "The evidence is in the national office." We asked why they had not got it, and the answer was that it was addressed to the National Executive Committee. It was understood that the National Executive Committee would hold its session previous to the session of the convention. They voted not to do so. Their vote not to hold their meeting previous to the convention was taken at a time after this material was addressed to them. Consequently it was not competent for us to receive mail addressed to the National Executive Committee. At any rate we did not feel that we had authority to call for it and take the matter out of their hands. Now then, the comrades are here from both sides. We feel that the time to attend to this is now, while they are all here. The matter is of national importance, and the comrades are all here. The committee do not feel that it is their business to decide a matter which the constitution says shall be handled by the National Executive Committee. We therefore ask that they take it up, address themselves to it at once and report to this convention.

DEL. CLARK (Texas): It is true that there are merits on both sides. To go away from this convention without considering the contesting delegations I believe would be a crime against the Socialist Party of Washington. Any organization that will come all the way from Washington here in the effort to do something to harmonize the differences that now exist in Washington and demand that it be threshed out in this convention, certainly have some strong reason for making this effort. Now, comrades, if I had known that the National Executive Committee was going to turn down the consideration of this question I never would have decided as I did. It was the object of our recommendation that this question should be settled by the National Executive Committee. We can run this convention without them while they settle this important question. Let them

bring their evidence back here to this convention and report it; and, for God's sake, let us not have another Nebraska question.

DEL. OSBORNE (Cal.): I move a substitution for the whole, that the delegates from Washington be seated in full in this convention. (Seconded; lost.)

Minority report rejected. Majority report adopted. Report relating to North Dakota adopted.

NOMINATIONS.

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): I have an emergency matter that I desire to put before the convention. The local organization desires to arrange for a ratification meeting not later than Saturday night. To do that they must rent a hall and prepare for that meeting. To have the assurance that that ratification meeting will be held, it wants this convention to fix the latest hour at which the national nominations will be made, so that we may go ahead with our arrangements to ratify the work of this convention Saturday night if possible. Now, I make a motion, and you may amend it, that nominations for president and vice president shall be made by this convention not later than the adjournment on Thursday night. (Seconded; carried.)

COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION.

DEL. GUY E. MILLER (Colo.): I desire to make a motion in regard to the organization of this convention, providing for another committee on the question of—well, I guess its title might as well be "organization." I want to say that the membership of this committee ought to include all the national organizers, all the State Secretaries and as many members of the National Executive Committee as can attend those sessions, in an attempt to systematize propaganda and to indicate the lines along which information should be gathered. I move you that we elect a committee of nine under the title of Organization. (Seconded.)

DEL. PAULITSCH (N. Y.): I do not believe it is necessary for us to elect another committee of nine on the question of organization when we

have a Committee on Ways and Means. I believe it is within the province of that committee to bring in reports on the question of organization. Therefore I move as an amendment that this matter be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Amendment seconded and carried.

ASSISTANT SECRETARIES.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next business, according to the list as arranged by the Committee on Rules and handed to me, is the appointment or election of two assistant secretaries.

Strickland of Indiana, and Reilly of New Jersey, were elected.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS.

THE CHAIRMAN: I now appoint as Sergeant-at-arms Delegate John Collins of Illinois, and suggest as his first duty that he open the windows.

JUDGES AND TELLERS.

THE CHAIRMAN: Next is the election of four tellers and two judges to act in case of written ballots.

The following were elected tellers: Penrose of Arkansas, L. E. Floaten of Colorado, Gerber of New York, O'Hare of Oklahoma. The following were elected judges: Ambrose of Montana, Bentall of Illinois.

COMMITTEES.

THE CHAIRMAN: Next on the list is a Committee on Platform, of nine, not more than one from each State. Proceed to nominate. The chair does not recognize any motion during the nominations, so that you will all have a chance.

Nominations for Committee on Platform were made, vote taken by ballot, and the judges and tellers retired to count the vote.

DEL. PAULITSCH (N. Y.): I move that we proceed to the nominations for the committees. I move, also, that those accepting the nominations for the various committees shall have their names placed on printed ballots and that the vote shall be taken by means of those ballots and those receiving the highest votes shall be the choice of this convention. Any comrade being elected to two commit-

tees to choose which one he will serve on. (Seconded; carried.)

DEL. RINGLER (Pa.): I move that in case of the withdrawal of an elected delegate from one committee the next highest shall be declared a member of that committee.

The motion was duly seconded and carried.

Nominations were then made for the Committee on Constitution, Committee on Women, Press Committee, Auditing Committee, and Ways and Means Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: The tellers are ready to report the vote on Committee on Platform.

The tellers reported Simons, Hillquit, Untermann, Carey, Work, Clark, Berger, Miller of Colorado, and O. F. Branstetter elected as Platform Committee.

Nominations were then made for the Committee on Farmers' Program, the Committee on Foreign Speaking Organizations, and partly for the Committee on Labor Organizations.

Adjourned.

THIRD DAY'S SESSION

Del. Carey, chairman of yesterday, called the convention to order at 10 o'clock a. m. The secretary read the following communications:

"Nashua, Minn.

"To the National Convention, Socialist Party of America.

"Our hearty congratulations to the comrades at the convention, and best wishes for success in the great work. On behalf of Finnish Socialist Local, Nashua, Minn,

"Charles Telman,
"H. Cherry."

"Augusta, Ga.

"Socialist National Convention, Brand's Hall.

"Greetings from Local, Augusta. Our cheers for America's greatest convention.

(Signed)

"Mrs. A. W. Milquist."

"Montreal, Que.

"J. Mahlon Barnes, Secretary Socialist Party, U. S. A.

"The Socialists of Montreal in meeting assembled send Socialist greetings to your National Convention. Comrades, let us have Socialism in our time.

"The Canadian Socialist Party, Montreal.

"Schleckman and Wright,
"Committee."

"Sacramento, Cal.

"National Convention Socialist Party, Brand's Hall, Chicago.

"All hail to the comrades and fel-

low-workers assembled for the important work to lay out plans and select presidential candidates. Three cheers for Socialism.

(Signed)

"John Sason."

"Jersey City, N. J.

"Secretary Socialist Party Convention, Brand's Hall.

"With you for Socialism.

(Signed)

"Executive Committee Polish Socialist Alliance,

"C. Panki, Secretary."

"To the Delegates of the National Convention of the Socialist Party.

"Dear Comrades: Local Cook County has 98 branches located in different parts of the county, the great majority of them located in Chicago. Many of these branches carry on soap box campaigns during the warm season. This constitutes one of our best methods of propaganda. Knowing that many of the delegates in attendance are the regular soap-boxers in other parts of the country, we are desirous of using their presence in that capacity here in Chicago. We would fraternally request every delegate who is a public speaker to volunteer his services by leaving his name and address with the secretary of Local Cook County, who can be found among the Illinois delegation or at the booth of the Harp.

"Yours for Socialism,

"G. T. Fraenckel,
"County Secretary."

"To the National Convention of the Socialist Party.

"Dear Comrades: The Russian Social Democratic Society of Chicago sends its greetings to the representatives of the class conscious proletariat of the United States of America. Now that dark clouds are gathering over the troubled seas of capitalism, may this convention of the Socialist Party stand out like a beacon for those still groping in the dark, pointing the way to Socialism and freedom. Long live the International proletariat. Long live Socialism.

"Fraternally,

"Russian Social Democratic Society of Chicago."

Del. Slayton, of Pennsylvania, was elected chairman for the day.

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrades, I feel that you want to do business today, and if you do not do it you have got to ride over the top of your humble servant; so now be prepared to do it. (Applause.)

The nominations for the Committee on Labor Organizations were completed and nominations were made for the Committee on Government by Commission.

DEL. COWAN (Ohio): I move that we have the report of the Executive Committee on the Washington affair.

The motion was seconded and carried.

REPORT ON WASHINGTON CASE.

The National Executive Committee then made the following report:

DEL. WORK (Iowa): The committee met last evening to pass upon this matter. We have a report to present, and in order to make the report clear I would like to read the amendment to the national constitution adopted last November, which was sought to be invoked in this case. The amendment is as follows:

"In case of controversy in any State as to the validity of the title of its officers and the question of the recognition of the national organization, a referendum of the membership of the state to determine the question may be taken in the following man-

ner: A call signed by not less than one-third of the total membership of the State in good standing at the time the controversy arose, asking the National Executive Committee to take a referendum of the said State membership for the election of officers for the positions in dispute, shall be filed with the National Secretary. Upon receiving such call the National Executive Committee shall take a referendum of the membership of said State for the election of officers for the positions in dispute. All locals appearing on the State list at National headquarters in good standing at the time the controversy arose shall be privileged to make nominations, and all members in good standing at that time shall be entitled to vote."

The National Executive Committee decided that this amendment is not retroactive. It was adopted in November, 1907. I will now read the report:

"The National Executive Committee reports that it met and considered the Washington case, gave each side a hearing and took the following action:

"We reject the protest against the seating of the Washington delegates and the petition for a referendum in the State of Washington, on the ground, first, that since the enactment of the amendment to the national constitution in November, 1907, no controversy has arisen in the State of Washington; second, that the State organization of the Socialist Party in Washington against which the protest is made, is the duly, regularly constituted committee of the party in Washington. We recommend that the national organization offer its good services to the State Committee of Washington in an effort to bring about unity between the contending sides."

DEL. WORK: I would like to say further, that, as I understand it, this report does not contemplate that this convention shall decide upon the details as to how we shall offer our good services, but shall leave that to the National Secretary and the National Executive Committee in conference with the State Secretary and the State Committee of Washington after this

convention is over. (Applause.)

DEL. LEWIS (Ill.): I move the adoption of that report. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the report be adopted. Any remarks?

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): I have no desire to stir up controversy, but because I have no desire to stir up controversy I believe in meeting this thing right here and now. Seven members of the National Executive Committee that could have given us something positive one way or the other, have come in here with a beautifully worded program and everybody gets the glad hand. It does not amount to shucks in Washington. I have been in Washington and I tell you that all that this action of the National Executive Committee does is simply to say that a fight is going on. I stand here to tell you, no matter what you do, I stand here to make a prophecy that if this convention adjourns without taking definite action one way or the other in the case of Washington, then inside of a month you will read in the party press of another row in Washington. We have got to deal with this situation. I have already been notified as to what will happen to me as National Organizer for what I said; that they have got my record from New Jersey. Well, I have faced the capitalists, and I am not afraid of a few Socialists that try those tricks. I challenge any National Organizer that has been in the State of Washington—

DEL. A. M. SIMONS: I rise to a point of order. I do not think Del. Goebel has been criticised, and there is no use wasting time on that.

DEL. GOEBEL: I knew you would raise that point.

THE CHAIRMAN: If a speaker wishes to waste his time let him waste it. Proceed.

DEL. SIMONS: Then I appeal from the decision of the chair, because such a ruling would wipe out all regularity.

DEL. GOEBEL: You need not decide the point, because I will try to keep within the bounds that he seems to want me to keep in. I am trying to make a point. I want to be distinctly understood that I am not

here favoring either faction, for I have got through absolutely with them. But I believe both sides have made mistakes. I believe both sides are absolutely honest. Both sides simply make the mistake of believing that some power above has ordained them masters to save the Socialist rank and file of Washington from being stolen by some crooked capitalist method. That being the case, both sides having made mistakes and properly having come here and stated that they are unable to settle these factional fights within the state, the controversy is for the national office to step in and adjust. If this convention should give a decision like that in Nebraska, and say, "We make no reflections on either side; we do not know who is wrong; we do not care to mix in this fight, but we do know that Washington is a magnificent possibility with some of the finest members in the ranks on both sides, and we want all to work together; therefore, in the interest of peace, we, the National Convention, step into Washington; we say to them that we are temporarily going to declare that State unorganized; we are going to send this to a vote of the rank and file in Washington to say who they want for State officers, and when that decision has been put on record we are going to stand with the crowd that has got a majority in the referendum." Is there anything wrong about that? My friends claim to be regular. I call your attention to this: read the State constitution of Washington. They think we have a democratic organization. In that State the State Secretary is not nominated by the rank and file. The State Committee is not nominated by the rank and file; it is nominated by a delegate body, a State convention. If I control the State Committee I will say whose delegates shall sit in the State Convention. If I control the State convention I will nominate the candidates, and when I have nominated them I will say to the rank and file, "Vote for my nominees." That is the situation in Washington. Regular? Of course they are regular, but regular under those circumstances. You can do as you see fit, but you are simply putting off the day for this

national action, for the National Executive Committee to step in, not taking sides with either side, but saying to the rank and file who claim they have not been given a chance to say who is regular, that we will settle that; we will have a vote of that rank and file, and then make them stand by that vote of the rank and file. What did they tell us? They told us on this side that they have got 93 locals. If they have, they have got them in a hurry; they didn't have them when I was there. They say, "You have got a grievance." If I have got a grievance I challenge every other National Organizer that has gone to Washington in the last three years to stand up and tell whether my grievance is a personal grievance. They say they have 93 locals with a membership of 1400 or 1500. The other side claim a membership of 700. If that is the case, with 1500 on one side and 700 on the other, what have they to lose by a referendum? Nothing at all. That being the case, they themselves should consent to a referendum. They would lose none of their rights when the national officers were conducting that affair. They simply get their settlement direct instead of indirect. They say, "We don't want the stigma of being declared unorganized." We are not here for sentiment; we simply want to do the best we can, and the best way to do it is through the National Committee, so that both sides will feel that they have got a square deal. You take this case and I will show you local after local in Washington whose members are already completely disgusted and say it is no use doing anything. All you have to do is to go to their State constitution, and that settles it. We believe in fair play; let us show it. They say they have 1500. All right; put the 1500 up against the other 700 and get a square count and see whether they have 1500.

DEL. BERLYN (Ill.): I am in favor of the adoption of the report of the committee, for I could hardly see from the statement made by our National Executive Committee-member Work how they could do anything else. Then, besides, they say, "We have got a constitution." This demand that came to us—which I did not even oppose in the Nebraska case, but

I have got serious doubts about its judgment—of reorganizing every State and making threats to the conflicting factions, where will we stop? Let us pass a general resolution and reorganize, and we will be up in the air. We have got a wise provision of State autonomy. Even if you confined the controversy to the State where it exists you will prevent the party as a whole from getting mixed in it. In Washington it seems to me they have a fine lot of fish to fry. I do not admire much, either, the way they work it. Some of the people on either side I am perfectly disgusted with, but I feel willing to let that trouble stay in Washington; I do not want any of it in Illinois, and I do not believe anybody wants it settled except in their own State so that they can work harmoniously. I believe the report of the committee ought to be adopted and get over with it.

Now, as regards the National Organizers and their particular privilege about saying what is wanted, I am kind of long in the movement, and I will tell you that the force that tended to the disintegration of the S. L. P. was too much interference by National Organizers in local affairs. (Applause.) I was State Organizer in this State, and when a National Organizer came in he simply set you aside and he was the boss of the occasion. We want no more of that. Experience has taught us that we want to get away from that kind of game. I believe the report of the committee ought to be accepted as it is made.

DEL. JOSEPHINE R. COLE (Cal.): If you are going to have a democratic movement and at the same time have a centralized authority which will continually interfere with local affairs, you will have trouble. Comrades, you cannot settle local affairs by interference from national authority. If you settle it once it will break out again. We are told that the State of Washington has a constitution that is not democratic. Then I want to say to you that if the Socialists of Washington are not capable of taking hold of that situation themselves and framing a constitution that is in accordance with Socialist principles, you cannot make

one for them. (Applause.) Comrades, we might have the same thing happen in California tomorrow. If you are going to interfere with the organization it will tend to provoke a division. This proposition is offered for the sole purpose of having your National Committee interfere with the organization. Leave the local members to settle it for themselves. If a State has trouble let the State settle it themselves, but do not admit a state into your National organization unless it has a constitution in accordance with Socialist principles. See to it that it is admitted, and see to it that it is framed reasonably in accordance with the Socialist program. You cannot settle the affair. You simply throw Washington out. I thank you for your attention.

DEL. LEWIS (Ill.): Comrade Chairman and Fellow Delegates: Comrade Goebel says, "I have been in Washington." So have I—longer than Comrade Goebel, and especially in the city of Seattle, which is the scene of this conflict. I am sorry to hear any delegate on this floor denounce either of these sides as a capitalist gang. (Applause.) Such a statement, and the fact that Comrade Goebel uses such terms, shows—

DEL. GOEBEL: I rise to a point of order, that I made no such point; that I purposely said both sides were honest, that they were afraid of a capitalist gang stealing them.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point is well taken.

DEL. LEWIS: I stand corrected. I apologize to Comrade Goebel for the misunderstanding. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: All right; go ahead.

DEL. LEWIS: I left the State of Washington to come East, or to go South on my way East, because I could not agree to work with the present delegation, so that I am not prejudiced in their favor. But the first day I arrived in the State of Washington to work as a State lecturer for the regular State Committee, the protestants against the present delegation, before I had been in the State five hours, took me into a caucus and gave me to understand that the only condition upon which my work would be allowed to pro-

ceed at all in the State of Washington was that I should enter into an agreement with these same protestants to clean out the State office. (Applause.) And as a stranger I was expected to do that; and because I told them I had not come to Washington to enter into any local affairs or add to any existing disturbances, much less attempt to clean out a State office, these protestants did all they could to prevent my getting dates through the regular State organization, and more than once they shut me off the streets of Seattle and I had to spend my evenings idle, when I was there for no other purpose than to propagate Socialism on the street corners. Another thing: I noticed in the headquarters at Seattle men who had their faces scratched up. I thought they had been in a cat fight; I thought they had fallen downstairs, or something, and I asked how these men came to have their faces scratched up. I discovered that the man who has traveled all the way from Washington to protest against this delegation, every time he had a dispute in the city headquarters with any member who would not agree to his proposal, the next thing he did was to scratch up his opponent's face with his finger nails, and the membership in Seattle state that they took it because they owed this man money and he told them that if they did not accept his motions and agree to his propositions he would demand his loan back and put the organization into bankruptcy. (Laughter.) Now, I only mention these things to give you an idea of the state of affairs in Washington.

Delegate Goebel says that if we do not do this there will be another fight in Washington. No matter what you do or do not do, there will be another fight in Washington (applause), and there will be fighting in Washington for years to come, and the best thing you can do in this convention is to keep your fingers out of it. (Applause.)

DEL. MILLER (Nev.): Comrades, I have listened to this debate with a good deal of amusement. I do not know whether it is vital to the decision of this question whether anybody

had his eyes scratched or not. I do not think the personal element, either the position of Comrade Goebel or the ideas of Comrade Lewis, amounts to anything. There is a fight in the State of Washington and there has got to be one more round. The question is, shall that round be left to the people of Washington to scrap back and forth through 49 rounds? (a voice, "yes") or shall we have one round under the control of the National organization, and get a final decision? The fact is that a fight is on. There is a certain kind of constitution in Washington which takes the rule of the party in Washington practically out of the hands and control of the local membership of that State, and that is absolutely contrary to every principle of party rule that we believe in. Now, shall we let that thing go on, or shall we say, "You shall take one referendum under the control of our National headquarters and settle it, and settle it at once, and those who want to stay out after that are out, and out for keeps so far as the National Socialist Party is concerned." Now, when a State convention arrogates to itself to nominate candidates for State offices and they think they are doing something that they have a right to do as in the State of Washington, some other people in some other State will be trying the same thing, and I believe it is time now, if Comrade Lewis does not want the same condition in Illinois, or if Comrade Cole does not want the same condition in California, to put a quietus upon the proposition right now.

The proposition is for us to decide, there is no question about it. The national party will have a finger in the pie, whether you will or not. We cannot have a question of that kind drag along endlessly, destroying the propaganda and the power of our comrades in Washington. I believe the question can be settled and settled right, and it will be settled right when they bring in a report that will settle every phase of the question. But a resolution deciding nothing would have no effect; it does not change the situation at all. That resolution is a good one. It is provided that there shall be a referendum from the Na-

tional office for the purpose of ending the State difficulty. It is proper in this case. The National office with far less reason declared the State of Nebraska unorganized, and now there is reason to declare Washington unorganized, when the condition is far much worse. I believe this motion of Comrade Lewis should not carry, and the National Executive Committee should forthwith issue a referendum to every Socialist in good standing in Washington and let the question be settled. I do not know why the comrades are opposed to a referendum vote. Is there any fear of the result? Don't we believe in it? Let them all vote, and when they have voted once it will come up again in the national councils.

DEL. BOOMER (Wash.): I want to ask Comrade Miller if he has read the constitution of the State of Washington?

DEL. MILLER: I have.

DEL. BOOMER: We deny that it conflicts in any way with the National constitution.

DEL. FIELDMAN (N. Y.): Comrades, I am an absolute stranger to both sides of this question, and I do not believe I have got to prove that statement. I have come to a certain conclusion on the basis of the arguments that I have listened to here on this floor. I knew very little indeed about the question until I heard the comrades on each side, and I am very much impressed with what the delegate that spoke last stated here. Both sides of the discussion admitted that there was something wrong with the situation in the State of Washington, and they both admitted, or claimed, rather, that what was wrong with the situation of the Socialist Party in the State of Washington is that a certain number of comrades or some member of a committee, or commission, if you please, has the power to determine the methods and manner in which questions are to be decided or voted upon or determined in that State. That is to say—

DEL. BROWN (Wash.): A point of order. No member from Washington has presented his case, and those are not the facts; there is no such power in the State of Washington.

DEL. FIELDMAN: It was stated on this floor that some sort of a committee had control of the Socialist Party of the State of Washington. It does seem to me that those who have come here with that charge should have armed themselves with their detailed facts. What is the law? I am anxious to hear that law, and on the basis of that it seems to me we ought to act. If it be true that in the Socialist Party of the State of Washington the membership has no power to control the acts of the whole party, that they cannot submit questions to a referendum vote whenever they see fit to do so, then it is up to us to settle that question. If it is possible for any number of members that are in a minority to absolutely control the will of the majority, or rather defeat the will of the majority in the State of Washington, then it is impossible to settle that fight in Washington unless the National organization takes charge of the question and submits the proposition to a referendum in that State under its control and thereby learns the opinion, the will and the desire of every member in the State of Washington of the Socialist Party. (Applause.) I submit, Mr. Chairman and delegates, that it is necessary that the opinion and desire of every member of the Socialist Party of the State of Washington be known before it is possible to settle this proposition. Now, if there be any one person here that has the law that is referred to, that it is claimed makes it impossible for the membership to govern the Socialist party in the State of Washington, I demand that that law be read here.

DEL. BROWN: We have it.

DEL. DAVIES (Pa.): Let us hear the law of Washington.

A DELEGATE: A question of personal privilege. Can't we have this read so as to save time?

DEL. HOEHN (Mo.): Mr. Chairman—

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrade Hoehn has the floor.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS (Ill.): A question of information. Will not Del. Hoehn permit this section of the law to be sent up to the secretary and read? I ask that it be sent up

and read, so as to avoid the chance of any comrades being mistaken.

DEL. HOEHN: Very well.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that is fair.

A sheet containing the State constitution of the Socialist Party of Washington was sent to the secretary, and it was decided that the secretary should read it.

DEL. SPARGO (N. Y.): I rise to move that the protestants be asked to read the passages, to point out the passages to which they object. There is absolutely no sense in asking a man who is absolutely unfamiliar with the constitution and the law to pick it out at a moment's notice. He either must read the whole thing and depend upon our picking out the passages as he reads, or we do not have any assurance that his selection will be the wise one. Now, the protestants make certain statements and charges. They contend that they have in that document a justification for their charges. It seems to me that the only logical thing is to call upon them to read the passages which they charge sustain their objection. Therefore I move that they be called upon to read the passages to which they make objection. (Seconded.)

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): I move to amend, that Delegate Goebel of New Jersey be requested to point them out. He is the one who made the charge here, and Delegate Miller of Nevada, and it is up to them to point out the passages in the constitution and not to ask outsiders.

DEL. SPARGO: We accept that amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is accepted as the original motion. It is moved and seconded that Comrades Miller and Goebel point out the passages which they want read.

DEL. GOEBEL: Is this debatable?

THE CHAIRMAN: It is debatable.

DEL. GOEBEL: Then I want to suggest that those who ask me to do that know perfectly well that I can't do it right now, and that is why they ask me to, unless I am very much mistaken. Now, I want to make a fair proposition, as I see it. I have made a statement and I challenge those that I have named on the

Washington State delegation to deny it. Inside of twenty-four hours I have referred this very passage of the constitution to Comrade Boomer and Comrade Brown, and they have both admitted that I was right about the matter about the election of State officers, and both confessed they thought it was wrong. Both confessed to me it was wrong. Therefore they confess that what I have said is true. Even though I do not have a copy of the State constitution of Washington in my hand, I make this proposition. We have no interest in either side. We want to act for the best interests of the National Socialist Party. I suggest that instead of having further debate from Miller, myself or anybody, we allow the Washington delegates to name somebody to take ten minutes for them to put before you their side, and then allow the other side ten minutes, and having heard both sides, then settle it.

DEL. HILLQUIT: I do not think we ought to take the position offered by Comrade Goebel. Delegate Goebel says he cannot point out the objectionable portion. I say that any delegate who is prepared to make a charge in open convention ought to be ready to point it out. (Applause.)

DEL. A. M. SIMONS: There is only one section there, and it will only take half a minute and it will be over with.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is a motion before the house, and your chairman can do nothing but put it.

DEL. STEDMAN: I ask now that that section be read as a point of information by the reading clerk. You always have a right to information before you vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is correct. Your motion is to read?

DEL. STEDMAN: I am not making a motion. I am asking for a point of information. A section has been referred to. I ask that the section referred to be read.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is to read it. All in favor of reading say aye. Contrary. The ayes have it.

DEL. MILLER (Nev.): This platform is in detached pieces, but I have it marked and I am going to read it. (Reading.) "Section 8. The State

committee shall elect a chairman, a secretary-treasurer and such other officers and assistants necessary to carry on the work of the State and translate the proceedings of the State organization into foreign languages if necessary. It shall employ — when it thinks advisable . . . and call upon the membership, . . . lecturers in organized States."

Section 17 refers to the same thing, the same offices.

A DELEGATE: Read it.

DEL. MILLER (reading): "The State Secretary-treasurer, Organizer or other assistants elected by the State Committee shall, for cause other than a party reason, be removed by said committee from office, subject to the same procedure." These two things are all I can find.

DEL. HERMAN (Wash.): What is the procedure?

DEL. MILLER: The same as in case of troubles and—

DEL. HERMAN: All right, we want to know what that is.

DEL. MILLER: Wait till I find it.

DEL. KRAFFT (N. J.): A point of information. Our delegates would like to know how the State Committee is elected.

DEL. HOEHN (Mo.): I am in favor of the adoption of this report. I believe that the report is a splendid document and I also believe it is the duty of the National organization to build a fence as high as the Rocky Mountains around the State of Washington until they are through with their fighting.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): My voice is not in very good condition and you will do me a great favor by giving close attention. I am not going to keep you very long.

Under the present constitution the National Executive Committee could not make any different decision. It is queer also that those who opposed State autonomy so bitterly seven years ago are so very much in favor of it now. But since I am one of the originators of State autonomy that is rather flattering to me. It seems to me as we have it and it is working so well it ought to be kept up even if it does work a little injustice in individual cases. And so it does. Here is a case where about 700 Socialists

who would like to belong to the organization are kept out—and I don't know why. One crowd says the other crowd is bad and then the other crowd says these are bad people. I believe to some extent they are both right. (Laughter.) I mean to say that they are both good and bad. I don't see any angel wings flapping on the delegation, when they rise as they have done. I could not help just telling my neighbor Hillquit that they knew the ropes, and when I heard the other man yesterday—he is a cook by trade and a good union man, and so forth—he has not learned the art of politics in any way, shape or manner. I thought if such a thing should happen in Chicago or New York it would be done on a different scale entirely.

A DELEGATE: Or even in Milwaukee.

DEL. BERGER: It seems to me that this is all we can do. It is all that we can do under the conditions. Their case is different from the case in Nebraska. In Nebraska there was not any party tangle; there was one man with whiskers, and one man with a mustache, and one with nothing. That was about all there was left of the party in Nebraska. They did not pay any dues or anything. On the other hand, those three men kept out about 150 Socialists. Of course we could not do anything else but declare the State disorganized, because it was a fact. The State had been disorganized. But there we have a strong organization—whatever you may say about that crowd, they know how. They have an organization of about 1500 members—

DEL. BROWN (Wash.): Two thousand.

DEL. BERGER: Be careful, Brown, you only pay dues for 1500. They have an organization of 1500 and that has to be respected. In war and politics, as on the economic field, it is the real power that counts; nothing else counts. If they had only five or ten members we could have made very short work of it; but they are 1500 and you cannot do that. On the other hand, it would be a disgrace and a shame to the party if being 1500 of them they could not have sense enough and justice enough after they

cooled off a little to take in the other 700.

Why, comrades, as one of the members of the Executive Committee remarked, that is a good deal more than the entire Socialist Labor Party—larger than the entire Socialist Labor Party in the entire country. (Applause.) Give me all your attention and save your applause until I am through. There they have about 700 men fully as good Socialists as the others, and they are kept out—I don't know why. It is not like them, it is not like Krueger, it is not like Brown, although he is a lawyer, and as a rule I don't like lawyers, but they are all good fellows, but it seems to me they ought not to keep out so many hundreds of Socialists. If there is any possible way let us get them in. And that is why the National Executive Committee offered its good services to unite them. Of course I would not make a very good angel of peace. I am not supposed to be a very peaceful man as a rule. I never heard my own wings flapping very hard, but we can find some suitable man to go out there and unite them. Goebel is very much of my own make-up. He is a good effective organizer, but he is too decided in his opinions on a good many subjects, just the same as I am. So let us have somebody else, somebody who can unite both forces, both sides, into one strong body, so that instead of having 1500, you will have have not merely 2200, because the 700 will bring 2,000 more.

I move that you accept the report of the committee, but before you do so, in justice to both sides I would ask the comrades to hear the representative of the contestants. He has no horns and no hoofs. I have looked all over him. He has as good looking a face as I have seen anywhere, although I am not an Irishman. Give him a chance to be heard for ten minutes, and then the other side for ten minutes, and it will not hurt anybody. I say accept the report of the committee, that is, without any change.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would not our friends from Washington agree to that proposition to allow the representative from the one side to talk and then allow Washington to close the debate? Will they not consent to

that? I ask the question of the delegation through Comrade Brown.

DEL. BROWN: I ask permission to confer with the Washington delegation.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is a sensible proposition if they agree to it. All in favor of permitting a conference of the Washington delegation say aye. The ayes have it and the permission is given.

DEL. STRICKLAND: I move that the previous question be ordered after the Washington comrades have presented their case.

A DELEGATE: I second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion. Shall the previous question be put at that time? All in favor will say aye. The ayes have it and it is agreed to. You will understand that the two sides are to speak and then the previous question will be ordered and then there will be four speeches to bring the debate to a close.

DEL. BROWN (Wash.): I submit, Mr. Chairman, and delegates of this convention, that Washington has been hearing its affairs discussed, and Washington has not opened its mouth in its own defense. In justice to myself, in justice to the Socialist movement in Washington in its relation with the Socialist movement throughout the world, I now ask that Washington be given an opportunity before this convention to wash its own linen, and after your minds have been disillusioned of the charges that have been made, you can give us your cool, solid judgment, and Washington will always yield to the judgment of the Socialist party. But we want an opportunity to be heard in our own defense, and we ask that we be not shut off until we have had that full opportunity.

DEL. KRUEGER (Wash.): I second the motion.

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.) I move that the Washington delegation, this being a trouble in their own state, to place their whole case before the convention.

THE CHAIRMAN: How much time?

A DELEGATE: Ten minutes.

DEL. MORGAN: I think they ought to have as much time as they deem necessary to place the facts before the convention.

DEL. STRICKLAND: I move to

amend by making it twenty minutes for each side.

A DELEGATE: I second the motion.

THE SECRETARY: It is moved that the Washington delegation have twenty minutes and that the other side have twenty minutes also. All in favor of the amendment will say aye. Those opposed, no. The amendment is carried. All in favor of the motion as amended will say aye. Those opposed, no. It is agreed to. The protesting side starts off. Who speaks for the other side?

COMRADE HUTCHESON: I wish to speak on that side.

DEL. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, a point of information. While Comrade Hutcheson is taking the platform I wish to ask if the Washington delegation will have twenty minutes and our accusers twenty minutes and then after the question has been put there will be two five minute speeches on each side?

THE CHAIRMAN: That is correct.

COMRADE HUTCHESON: In the state of Washington there has been a controversy going on for a good many years. That controversy first started when Dr. Herman F. Titus entered the Socialist party. It has been going on ever since, but not so bitterly during the time that he left and took his paper from there and went to Caldwell; but after he came back again the old bitter fight was taken up and it is on now. There are certain things that we comrades who are on the outside of the party deem illegal there, and we think that we were illegally deprived of our rights to be members of the Socialist party.

Comrade Herman last night stated before the National Executive Committee that I was an undesirable, and should not be a member of the Socialist party, and they did not want me as a member of the Socialist party, and others he named there who are with us.

Now I want to state a few facts here to show why there is a contention that there is an illegality there in the state of Washington.

In 1906, about June or July, the unions and some others held a convention. It was called a union labor convention. A great many of our boys were anxious to see what the rank and file would do in a political convention. They went to the Labor Temple. When they got there they found they could not enter,

as an individual was standing there handing them cards on which was written "I, the undersigned, pledge myself to support the candidate or nominee, nominated at this convention," then giving the name, address, occupation and date. Well, they were stumped, but one of the boys said "Pshaw, I am going to write a fictitious name, a fictitious occupation, a fictitious address, and go in." So he did. Comrades Wagenknecht and Callihan brought charges against three of those members. We tried two of them and it was proved by Comrade Wagenknecht's own statement that when a division of the house was called for so they had to show who was taking part in the convention, these comrades—not only these three but some nine or ten or eleven others, got up and walked out of that convention, and showed in that way that they had not been taken into the convention.

The charges against the comrades were treason. We rendered a verdict that they had not committed treason. The only two votes against that were those of Comrades Callihan and Wagenknecht. Comrade Wagenknecht was the chairman of the local quorum. That is made up of five members of the state committee. And Comrade Wagenknecht took the decision up from the local to the local quorum, and there they had a resolution to revoke the charter of Local Seattle, and the state committee revoked the charter of Local Seattle by a vote of something like nine to six. There are fifteen members.

Prior to the revocation of the charter of Local Seattle Comrade Wagenknecht was a member of Local Seattle. He took a transfer of his membership from membership in Local Seattle, which was under charges, to membership at large. Two members of the local quorum denied him that right. Two members gave him that right; so there was a tie, and he as chairman voted himself a membership at large and thereby retained himself as a member of the Socialist party, giving himself the right as judge and jury to decide our fate. Now, there was nothing in the state constitution that deprived us of the rights of voting, and nothing in the national constitution, but there are passages there that state that any member in good standing shall have the right to vote on referendum.

They did not deny Local Spokane—when they revoked the charter of Lo-

cal Spokane—the right to vote whether they should be put out, but when it came to Local Seattle, Local Seattle that had 388 members in good standing and some 500 or 600 more that would have been in good standing, they denied us the right to vote on whether or not the state committee should be sustained in revoking the charter.

They refused to send ballots to us. There was a referendum sent out asking that question of the rank and file, and the rank and file decided that we were to be deprived of that right. Another referendum was called as to whether or not Comrade Wagenknecht should hold the chairmanship of the Local Quorum, and transfer it to membership at large, and that they voted down, voting "No." There was another referendum as to whether or not Comrade Wagenknecht's action in the Local Quorum could be sustained or not; and it was not sustained.

Now, during this time some members of Local Seattle who were on the other side, Comrade Callihan and others, not Comrade Wagenknecht, because he was a member at large, they asked for a charter for a local in Seattle, pending the time when the rank and file should decide whether our charter was revoked or not. Two members of the Local Quorum gave them the right, and two voted against it, and Comrade Wagenknecht as chairman, and an interested party, gave them the charter. Then he transferred the membership to membership at large and he was a member in good standing as judge and jury in our case.

At the 1906 convention a resolution was passed stating that in the opinion of this convention all acts of the Local Quorum and of the State Committee where Wagenknecht voted and where his vote was a decided factor, were illegal and void. That was passed by referendum. I think they have it over there.

Now, when this question came up whether or not another charter could be granted to a local, a referendum was called on that and the rank and file decided it could not. Therefore, there did not exist a second local in the city of Seattle, but this referendum was counted the evening before the state convention. The next morning at nine o'clock the state convention convened.

Some time after the counting of these

referendum votes, between ten and eleven o'clock or possibly near twelve o'clock in the morning, after one member, J. C. Robbins, had left the Local Quorum, Comrade Wagenknecht and some others re-granted this charter to a few that were there and had by a resolution ratified the delegates that the organization had elected previously as the delegates to the state convention.

The next day at the State Convention, they, with the aid of the members at large, had a majority in the convention so that these members at large had full power there, and by that they organized the convention, elected their own credentials committee, seated themselves, and went to work to fix up the situation and everything there to suit themselves.

I will admit, comrades, that we have been easy. It takes a workingman a long time to learn some of these things and we have had against us Comrade Titus, one of the slickest parliamentarians, assisted by a few more like himself, that ever came down the pike. When there is a motion put before the house, they can bring up more points of order, more subsidiary resolutions, amendments, and amendments to the amendments, than you ever heard of. And we often didn't know where we were at.

But we have learned a good deal. We have graduated from that school. We have got to the point now where we cannot get into this party any more. By their acts, they say, that it is impossible for us to get back into the party. They state that I am undesirable and they don't want to have me in.

When one of the members of the National Executive Committee asked him if there weren't a good many of the seven hundred who were all right, he said he thought that some were, and then when he asked if the makeup of the seven hundred was any different from the makeup of their party, well, he said he couldn't say that they were.

Those who want an organization in the State of Washington not of 1,500, but of 4,000 or 5,000, or 6,000, we, who want to work with the Trades Unions and not against them, we are asking admission to the Socialist party. We want admission to the Socialist party, and that is what we are going to get, I don't care if it takes two or three or

four, or five, or even ten more years.

You can turn us down in this convention, and I will tell you, we will come back here four years from now, if we are not then in the party, fighting to get in again." (Applause.)

DEL. BROWN (Wash.): I do not see why any man, or set of men who have fought themselves out of the Socialist party should not be able in the same manner to fight their way back into the Socialist party. (Applause.)

Now, gentlemen, with your kind attention—give your applause afterwards—every incident that Comrade Hutcheson has related to you happened long before the national constitution was amended so that the national body could step into the state of Washington and declare our state unorganized.

What are the facts there? He has talked about Titus. Titus is the one man in the state of Washington who has given his all, his health and everything, to the Socialist movement. I am not a friend of Titus, but I am a Socialist.

Now listen, comrades. The matters concerning Wagenknecht, and what he did, let us consider that. What was the condition of the Socialist party then? The Socialist party had something like 300 or 400 members. What was the condition then? Could anyone get in then? I say no and I live there. What is the condition of the Socialist party now? We have 1,500 members accounted for, dues-paying members. We have the widest organization, and the largest membership as compared to population of any state in the union.

What Comrade Herman said or what the National Executive Committee did you can hear from them. They are here. You have not heard the evidence. You have heard declarations by the man interested in the final determination of this question. But the National Executive Committee has heard the evidence; they have scrutinized the evidence; they have passed judgment upon the case, and they were fully competent after hearing all the evidence and weighing it, to pass judgment on the case. And now for a man to come before this convention and make idle declarations—he does not tell you what the evidence is, but he wants you to pass upon those idle declarations in the absence of the absolute evidence. Well, gentlemen, I can't believe you will do it.

(At this point a low whistle was

heard from one of the delegates.)

DEL. BROWN: I accept that whistle, too.

THE CHAIRMAN: Perfect courtesy will injure no man's cause; so let us have it.

DEL. BROWN: The present Socialist Party of Seattle has never allowed at any time an election to go by—they have never at any time assembled in convention that the labor movement has not been always considered.

We had our headquarters in the Labor Temple of Seattle until one Walter Thomas Mills, by an intrigue, drove us from the Labor Temple; and Comrade Hutcheson was there, aiding and abetting that work. Then as soon as we were driven out of the Labor Temple in Seattle, Walter Thomas Mills took up his work in the Labor Temple of Seattle until the labor movement drove him out before he had given three lectures, and we had had that temple for months.

Five locals in the State of Washington made demand for a referendum, and mind what I tell you, we are not afraid of a referendum, although we don't care for a referendum every day before breakfast; but we are organized and the only reason we don't want at this time a referendum is because the fall campaign is coming on and we believe it will have the effect of disorganizing the grand work that these boys have done in the months of the past.

Those things that have passed, have passed. I tell you, if Washington is let alone, she will solve her own problem. The Socialist party of Washington is entitled to as good an organization as they are competent to get. And they are bound to have an organization, and the only organization that can do the work in Washington is the kind of organization they have there now.

Comrade Goebel made some remarks about the delegation from Washington, and I presume I was the target, but notwithstanding those declarations I want to say to you that we have been lined up and organized upon as straight, scientific proletarian and Socialist lines as exist in the United States, or in the world.

Let us alone and we will wash our dirty linen and wash it clean.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT (Wash.): I am not going to make an oration, and I hope you will clear your minds of all prejudice. This is not the place for prejudice. This is no place for hissing or whistling. If you are prejudiced you cannot think, and no Socialist should be prejudiced. Having prejudice, you cease to think scientifically, because no prejudiced man is able to consider anything scientifically.

Comrade Hutcheson claimed that we had an autocratic organization in Washington. The question whether we have an autocratic organization in Washington is not the question. The question is, does the rank and file rule. If the rank and file rule, then we have democratic rule, and you vote for us. If the rank and file does not rule, you vote against it.

Your national organization no more than two years ago had its National Secretary elected by the National Committee. Your National Committee, if I am not mistaken, elected the National Executive Committee, and that same principle we had in Washington with the exception that our State Committee is nominated by the State delegate convention. They nominated the State Committee and the names go to a State referendum vote. And these State committeemen are elected by a majority vote of the membership in the State of Washington.

I don't care what happened before 1907. We fight in Washington when we fight, and we take all the advantages we can. There is no use saying anything about it, to tell the truth. You have all had your scraps. You are not going to allow a man to draw a gun on you, if you can prevent it, and we do not fight that way in Washington.

In 1906 we had a love-feast. Hutcheson came in with us; they helped us. But after that they were again expelled. Expelled for what? Expelled for refusing to try one of their members for compromising. That is the reason. I claim in Washington that you are either for fusion or against fusion, and the two factions line up on that principle of tactics.

If you should decide in favor of Comrade Hutcheson, and that you

want him in your organization, you can have him, but we don't want him. Why don't we want him? We don't want anybody, and we don't want him, who is going around the State organizing locals against us. He went one place on the pretense of organizing a local of those who were expelled for voting the capitalist ticket. We don't want him."

A DELEGATE: He is undesirable, then?

DEL. WAGENKNECHT: Certainly, he is undesirable.

We do not ask you to listen to orations on this matter. We ask you to use your common sense. Comrade Miller is a good orator. Comrade Goebel is probably second to Comrade Miller, but the fact remains that they have made assertions where they have no proof. We make assertions which we can prove.

We have our State constitution and we know our State laws, and here is the question: If the Socialist Party of the United States is a party based upon the interest of the working class, if the Socialist Party of the United States is a party based on the class struggle, then the Socialist Party of the United States must follow the tactics that result from the principles, and those tactics are anti-fusion and no compromise.

If the Socialist Party of the United States is that kind of a party, then this convention must vote with the National Executive Committee, because the regular party in Washington is anti-fusion and uncompromising.

DEL. HERMAN (Wash.): The charge is made that the organization in Washington is not democratic and that our constitution is autocratic. They have not gone so far as to say that it is in conflict with the national party constitution.

I wish to say first that the constitution of the State of Washington was not drawn up to suit George H. Goebel, or Miller, or Nevada, or any other individual. The constitution of the Socialist Party of Washington was drawn up to suit the Socialist Party membership of the State of Washington. Goebel says that he does not like the state committee of the Socialist Party of Washington, and the state committee of the So-

cialist Party of Washington does not like George H. Goebel; and there are other members in the state of Washington, outside of the state committee, who do not like George H. Goebel, and the reason is, that when George H. Goebel came into the state of Washington he wanted to instruct the state committee on what terms he should tour the state of Washington, and the state committee decided that they were the ones who had authority, and they would instruct George H. Goebel as to the terms under which he should tour the state of Washington, and the state committee of the Socialist Party of Washington went out as it always has done.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): If these statements are made about me I shall demand an opportunity to be heard in reply.

DEL. HERMAN: It is not a question of whether we have a perfect organization. We are not looking for a Moses. The wage workers of the state of Washington who are organized in the Socialist Party, and those who are in sympathy with the wage working class who are organized in the Socialist Party of Washington need no Moses to lead them out of the wilderness. We can take care of our own affairs. We do not need Herman F. Titus, or Walter Thomas Mills, neither—but in justice to Titus I want to say this: That no man who has been upon this platform can point out a single instance where Herman F. Titus has ever been disloyal to the Socialist Party or a traitor to the working class. That is all the distance I want to go in respect to Herman F. Titus.

However, we have to fight these people, this reform element, that is inside the Socialist Party, and we have fought them since the time that the Socialist Party was first organized in Washington. We have fought them and beaten them in every instance from 1900 up to 1907. In 1906 they were taken back into the organization, and it was through the influence of that so-called "Little Giant," Walter Thomas Mills, after he had extracted from the Propaganda Club, which was composed of expelled members of Local Seattle about a thousand dollars' worth of property, and then when they got into the Socialist Party the same Tribune Publishing Company, through the same agency, Hutcheson and other lieutenants, sold back the lit-

erature which had been collected out of the nickels and dimes of the working class of the city of Seattle, sold back to the party that literature which Mr. Mills got for nothing.

Now, this last time they thought they had somebody who could lead them to victory, but Walter Thomas Mills found that in the Socialist Party of Washington he was to meet his Waterloo, and that he could not introduce his reform ideas; and when he was expelled from Local Seattle, because Local Seattle refused to try him, it was then that this element went outside of the organization, and now, instead of fighting from the inside and trying to win there, they work from outside the organization and try to tear down what it has taken eight years to build up.

DEL. BOOMER (Wash.): I don't want to take up my five minutes, but I do want to state the reason why I have aligned myself with the comrades of Washington who are in the state organization. Underneath all these arguments, underneath all these things that pertain to the individuals, if you look closely you will find that there lies underneath the question of fundamentals the question whether it shall be a working class movement or a middle class muddled movement.

I have not lived in Seattle for five years. I have been out of touch with the so-called Titus faction and the so-called Mills faction. I have been trying to run a Socialist newspaper in a strong Republican community. While I lived there we all had our little arguments occasionally, each comrade stating his conviction, yet the reason I stand with the comrades here is because the facts have come to my knowledge that the organization which now controls the party in the state of Washington is by far the safer, by far the more representative of the working class movement, than are the men who are the protestants here, those who represent the other side.

Mr. Hutcheson, who came down through the valley, seeking to organize locals, paper locals, so as to make a protest to the national committee, he came to our town, and in the presence of myself and my wife, who is a member of the local, gave us one of the reasons why he opposed the present organization in the state of Washington that he did not believe a state committee should have the power to revoke the charter of

a local, even though that local endorsed the Republican or Democratic ticket; and because of that I will fight bitterly to the end any faction, any individual, any so-called Socialist, who stands for one moment for such a proposition.

I have talked with those men on the other side, and I have found that they do not believe in the class struggle, do not believe in drawing the class line, and believed that it was all right, many of them, in case the Socialist Party had no ticket in the field, to vote for some "good man" on the capitalist tickets. Those are the kind of men who are trying to break into the Socialist movement in the state of Washington. We do not deny admittance to any man or any woman, no matter what their profession or trade, if they can prove to the satisfaction of those who have to vote upon them that they are not only Socialists, but understand what Socialism is.

I shall object as long as I have a voice to admitting Comrade Hutcheson or admitting any comrade who refuses to acknowledge the fundamentals laid down by the working class of the world in their conventions, and refuse absolutely to admit men who believe that a Socialist may still have a right to vote a capitalist ticket as it may suit their convenience.

In Prosser, Washington, some time ago we had the necessity forced upon us of crossing off the names of two members of the party because at the last city election at Prosser, despite the fact that every member was to write the word "Socialism" on the ticket, because we had no ticket in the field, two of the members deliberately voted for one of the capitalist candidates, and acknowledged that they had done it. We crossed their names off the local. Comrade Hutcheson protested against such autocratic action on the part of Local Prosser and on the part of the members of the local.

It is because of these things that I stand where I do in the party organization of the state of Washington. It is a fundamental question, a question whether you want an organization there that stands for the wage worker, for the proletarian movement of the world, or whether you want an organization there that favors nothing that is fundamental, that pays attention to nothing except the matter of getting a large vote regardless of who they are or what they

know or believe about the movement.

That is the reason I stand with the Socialist organization of the state of Washington, because I believe that they represent the real, true working class expression in the Socialist movement in the state of Washington, and the others do not.

DEL. VANDER PORTEN (N. Y.): I listened with great interest to the arguments on both sides of this question, and I was deeply interested in the statement by Comrade Hutcheson respecting the position that they occupied in the state of Washington; but I have concluded that the National Executive Committee have done the only thing possible in view of the conditions that exist, and in view of the statement by Comrade Hutcheson that he is going to break into the Socialist Party if it takes him ten years. That position is a mistaken one, for neither Comrade Hutcheson nor Comrade Mills can break into the Socialist Party if we and every member of the National Committee will remember that the time has come when we are not seeking to enhance our strength by all sorts of dickers and combinations, having men pass through the country organizing all the opposing factions, using all their power to destroy our recognized and organized locals, as has been done in this case and in the case of Comrade Mills in his tour through Canada.

The principle that is involved in this fight is the same principle that caused the expulsion of this comrade; it is the same principle of opportunism where people demand the right irrespective of their view or the limits of the movement of becoming political factors. I say that from what has been said upon this floor today there is nothing left to this convention but to endorse the action of the National Executive Committee and declare most emphatically that we, the Socialist Party of America, stand always for the class struggle, stand always for the Socialist movement, and the men who have given their lives, who have given their health, given everything they have in behalf of Socialism, have not watched it develop to the position which it now occupies for the mere purpose of turning it at this late day into a middle class bourgeois institution.

If an emphatic, clear declaration of the position of the Socialist Party is ever required, this is the time, this is the moment; and while we are gaining

strength, to all politicians and all aspiring individuals who find the ranks closed against them in the other political parties, whose hopes have been blasted in the capitalist political parties, and who think that the Socialist movement is a good vehicle to land them in the places they aspire to, we say no. The class struggle is the fight that we are making, and individuals count for very little. Dr. Titus may have been a great factor in Washington, Comrade Herman may have been a factor in Washington, but the only real interest we have in this matter is the matter of principle, the matter of policy, whether the Socialist movement is going to be served by allowing them to be brought into the party who should be out of it. Let us recognize clearly that under no condition, whether it be Washington or Wisconsin or New York—under no condition is there any place in the Socialist Party of America for that kind of opportunism; and let it be said further that when this declaration is made we make it in order to give the voters an opportunity to vote upon it if they want to.

DEL. GOEBEL: I wish to speak against the report.

DEL. WOODBY (Cal.): A point of information. It has been charged that the parties on both sides are not Socialists. I want to know whether the parties in each combination signed the party pledge. I want to know whether they did or not.

THE CHAIRMAN: We cannot settle that question.

DEL. WOODBY (Cal.): Unless we know that—

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't think we can settle that question. These members must sign an application.

DEL. BROWN: Anybody can sign an application.

DEL. WOODBY: But, on the other side—I want to know whether both sides signed our application recognizing the class struggle.

THE CHAIRMAN: I cannot answer that. Delegate Goebel has the floor.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): I believe in state autonomy, and if you stand by the majority report state autonomy wins the victory, so I win either way; therefore, I am smiling.

I want to say a word or two on this matter. So far as I am personally concerned, I am going to say very little. Comrades sitting all over this hall know

Goebel, and whether he is simply hitting the high places or low places or fighting. National Secretary Barnes will tell you that I have an explicit understanding with him by which I could outline in some measure the line of work I was to do. I said to Barnes, "I am out to get in new locals. We can get them if you give me the chance." Barnes had the brains to give me the chance. He tried to get the state secretary to work with him. However, I got sixty-three—nothing to my credit—simply Barnes gave me the chance to work and get them in my own way. Two days before election Comrade Burgess, knowing I was coming in the state, although he knew I was coming months in advance, he kept me in suspense and then suddenly, two days before election, when he knew I was exhausted, he wrote me a list of dates when I was broken in voice and body, for the deliberate purpose of making it look as though I could not fill the requirements. They dared not turn down a man who was known all over the country as one of the best, so they had to find a subterfuge. Then I said, "This can't be done," and Barnes said I could rest fifteen days, and I wrote back a letter—it was not very sweet—my God, men, when a man has given the best he has, when he has given his life to the movement, why shouldn't he be nervous and irritable at times? I wrote the letter asking Burgess if there was anything against me personally, and if so, to write back and I would ask Barnes to put me in another state. He wrote back, "No, you are all right; I think you are one of the most effective organizers in this country, but you must know that we have got a scrap on, and we have got to be sure what side you are on; we have got to use caution as to the men sent by the national office, and they must use caution as to whether we ought to have them." I wrote back taking exception to this, and the dates were all canceled, and it looked then as though I wasn't good enough for Washington, in spite of a letter sent by Herman F. Titus, addressed to Spokane and received by me, in which he says that he understands that I have no dates, and that if I am free they would be glad to have me tour the state of Washington under the auspices of the Socialists of Seattle, soliciting subscriptions for them, and speaking in their interest. You see, I was not good

enough to represent the national office, but I was good enough, if I would solicit subscriptions for a sheet that had the gall and nerve to abuse and publish a ridiculous attack upon men like Berger, men that had given their lives to this movement. If those people were capitalists and I was a capitalist's politician, and I wanted to reach those people for my purpose, I would say, "I believe in the class struggle; the other fellows are opportunists," and unless they look closely into the substance of it, it would get them.

This is the point I wish to make. It is not a question of Goebel; it is a question of the right thing. Both sides have proved themselves as able politicians as there are in the movement. You cannot deny that. Both of them have shown clearly that they will not stop at any method to win out. One side say, "Mills is the Moses"; the other side says "Titus is the Moses"; and then you have what in the state of Washington? You have got a lot of Socialists and you have them so absolutely confused and tired out and bewildered by the tactics of the few contending sects of Moseses, two leaders of strong personality, both able men, with able lieutenants surrounding them.

Under all the circumstances I propose that you do not concur in this report, but declare the state unorganized, and thus at once give to these tired Socialists an opportunity to get their cards from the national office. That is my plan. They are tired of Moseses; they are tired of being saved; give the rank and file of Washington a chance to save themselves.

I know that the national office has no interest in this fight. All they want is to build up Socialism. Let them keep that state unorganized by taking action along this line, and that will mean that nearly all of the comrades will be in the Socialist movement and not engaged in a scrap.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS (Ill.): I wish to speak in favor of the adoption of the report, because of the fact that there is no other possible way out of this muddle in which we are at the present time. We cannot declare a state unorganized that is organized, and these comrades have a live, active, fighting organization in their state, on their side. We must admit that they are keen, shrewd and sharp, and sometimes unscrupulous in their tactics in the party. If they were to use those

same methods, that same shrewdness, that same activity, that same keenness that they have shown inside the party in fighting the capitalist class in Washington—they have sometimes, and I have watched them close—if they would use that altogether there, they would make a far more effective organization than they have today. Their organization is effective, and they have been very fortunate in some connections they have made. I agree with them that it is fortunate that Walter Thomas Mills is outside the Socialist Party. At the same time, because they have been able to do that, because they have had an opportunity to fight these men, they have built up what has become to a large extent a machine, which is used not simply against the capitalist class, but against men who are themselves Socialists. I don't know as to individuals. I don't know Comrade Hutcherson. I know nothing but what these men told us, and the Executive Committee, that they could not tell any difference between the general rank and file of the organization. There is too much tendency to make soap-box speeches at all times, to appeal at all times and all places and on every question, even on a point of order, to the "fundamentals of the class struggle," in hope that they will get a hand, which sort of thing ultimately becomes pure demagoguery, no matter how sincere it is, and I think that the best thing that this convention can do is to let it go out to the party throughout the country, as it has gone out very plainly from our discussion here, that we believe that these fellows are good comrades, good fighters, but they are using rather strong methods, and that they would better go back to Washington and try to set their house in order themselves, try to recognize as I say that the eyes of the country are on some of the things that they are doing, and they would better get in accord with the rest of the movement. But we have got to keep our hands off officially. We have no business monkeying with that situation. We will do nothing to make it worse and if we try to do something—if we declare it unorganized, we declare a lie in the first place and we would simply make it disorganized, if we make that declaration. So I ask you to support the position of the Executive Committee.

A DELEGATE: I want to ask a question. In offering its services to one

of the factions, are we not recognizing one of the factions?

DEL. SIMONS: May I answer that? We do not offer our services to those who are outside the party. We offer our services to the comrades that are there who have a perfect right to reject them if they do not want them.

DEL. DAVIES (Pa.): I am opposed to accepting the report of your Executive Committee, or the recommendation of the National Executive Committee, for the reason that should we accept that report we put a gag on progress. There are lots of people who want to come in and further the cause of socialism, who want to push the movement, not necessarily keeping a clear line perhaps, but on the other hand there is an element here represented by Comrade Goebel of New Jersey, who want to have the Socialist movement in Washington progressed. On the other hand, there is another element here who want to try to hold the Socialist movement to a clear uncompromising class consciousness—

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): A point of order: Under our rules, the different sides have to select their representatives, and this comrade, under the pretense of helping the contestants, is playing a shrewd trick. I stand for fair play and this is a trick.

THE CHAIRMAN: No one is entitled to the floor, unless he makes clear the side he speaks on.

DEL. BERGER: I want your decision. I think you stand for fair play.

THE CHAIRMAN: He is entitled to say his piece in his own way.

DEL. BERGER: If he is getting the floor by a trick, I say it is pretty rotten tactics.

A DELEGATE: I want to ask if he opposes the committee's report, and if he will vote against it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I can't answer that.

DEL. BERGER: Let him answer it.

DEL. DAVIES: I will vote to accept the report of the committee.

SEVERAL DELEGATES: Sit down. Get off the platform. Down, down.

DEL. VANDER PORTEN (N. Y.): I rise to a point of order, this comrade has no right to address the body.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you are out of order.

DEL. HERMAN: We wanted to de-

bate this along the lines laid down. We do not ask for any advantage; we do not want any unfair support. We want somebody who is opposed to the adoption of the report of the committee to get up there and state his position.

DEL. WALDHORST: I am against the acceptance of the report as submitted. It is for this convention to declare that such tactics as have been pursued in the state of Washington during the last two years are not the right way to make good Socialists. It has been known to all the comrades, it has been in all the papers just what has been done there, and I think the National Executive Committee, instead of accepting that report, or making that report as it is, without any recommendation whatever to either side, that they did not do right, and the convention should not follow the same method. I think we should set our feet down on any proposition such as they have in their State constitution, which is not in the spirit of the International or National constitution. If we want to keep democracy, then we ought to carry it out in our own party first before we go and ask anybody else to adopt it. If they don't want to carry out the initiative and referendum, and they have not denied a single thing that the comrade who was on the platform said—the comrade who spoke on the other side did not deny it—

DEL. BROWN: I deny it now.

DEL. WALDHORST: I am perfectly willing to concede that, but he has not denied the accusation that they did pursue the tactics that have been described here and they are not right. Both sides are to blame. I say let us do something that will settle once and for all any question that can come up in any state that will make it possible for any machine to be formed in the Socialist party, because if I despise anything it is a machine in this movement. If you want fair play give the rank and file fair play and you will get it. You won't have to be troubled about anyone else. I think that most of the comrades who have been in the movement as long as I have know very well what a machine is. I have been in it twenty-seven years, and I know what I am talking about. This is not the first time, I speak from personal experience, from what I have seen in the Socialist movement. I say it is about

time for this National Convention to step in there and say: "Here, boys, get straight before we will do anything more for you." I am not concerned in either one of them. You know as well as I do to defeat the report as it is. If they will amend it so as to make it mandatory on the National Executive Committee to get a referendum of the state of Washington, recognizing all as Socialists who will sign the Socialist plank of the party, I don't care what he is, or who he is, we will get the situation clear. The Nebraska situation would not have arisen if what I wish had been done in that case. So it will be in every state where the question may come up.

If this man, Walter Thomas Mills, goes into another state and gets hold of that state—he is a genius for organizing; he is a slick duck, I know him, I say, let him go into another state, and he will not be in that state very long before you will have the same proposition to face that you now have in that state of Washington. So I say, "Settle it now," settle it so that they cannot do any such thing as that, and then we shall be done with it. I think we have spent enough time on it now, but I think it will be a good thing if we spend a little more and get it right. (Cries of "Question, question.")

THE CHAIRMAN: The question before the house is the question of the adoption of the report of the Executive Committee.

A DELEGATE: I move it be taken by roll call.

DEL. COHEN (Pa.): I rise to a question of the highest privilege—

THE CHAIRMAN: What is the question of privilege by the Delegate from Pennsylvania?

DEL. COHEN: The Pennsylvania delegation wish it distinctly understood that we opposed Comrade Davies doing what he did, and counselled him not to do it. We want fair play. And the rest of the Pennsylvania delegation desire to go on record as disavowing any part in the action of Comrade Davies.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is, on the motion that the vote be taken by roll call. Those in favor, say "aye." Those opposed, "No." The "ayes" have it, and the vote will be taken by roll call.

The roll call on the adoption of the

committee's report was then taken as follows:

Yes:—ALA., Freeman; ARK., Hogan; ARIZ., Cannon, Morrison; CAL., Bradford, McDevitt, Wheat, Tuck, Cole, Merrill, Osborne, Johns, McKee, Bauer, Starkweather; COLO., Buie, Floaten, Maynard, Miller; CONN., Smith; DEL., Henck; ILL., Collins, Bentall, Berlyn, Brower, Fraenckel, Hunt, Knopfnagel, Lewis, Morgan, Kerr, M. W. Simons, A. M. Simons, Carr, Smith; IND., Strickland, Dunbar, Kunath; IA., Brown, Work, Shank; KANS., Wilson, Snyder, McAllister; KY., Seeds; LA., Hymes; ME., Pelsey; MD., Lewis, Toole; MASS., Carey, Hitchcock, Konikow, D. White, E. White, Mahoney, Putney, D'Orsay, Cutting, Fenton; MICH., Menton, Hittunen, Stirton; MINN., Peach, Kaplan, Maattala, Thorsett, Nieminen, Ingalls, Williams, Anderson, Macki; MO., Garver, Hoehn, Brandt, Pope, Callery, Lipscomb; MONT., Graham, Hazlett, Wesleder, Ambrose, Peura, Harvey, Powers; NEB., Porter; N. H., Wilkins, Arnstein; N. J., Killingbeck; Reilly; N. Y., Solomon, Wanhope, Hillquit, Lee, Lewis, Slobodin, Paulitsch, Fieldman, Hunter, Hanford, Gerber, Furman, Vander Porten, Peiser, Spargo, Cole, Strebel, Klenke, N. C., Quantz, N. D., Lampman, Anderson; OHIO, Prevey, Cowan, Bandlow, Vautrim, Ziegler, Farrell, Devine; OKLA., Hagel, Branstetter, Ross, Davis, Branstetter, Edwards, Dome, Block, Boylan, Wills, O'Hare; ORE., Varner, Ryan, Barzee, Crabtree; PENN., Adams,

Clark, J. E. Cohen, G. N. Cohen, Davies, Foley, Maurer, Moore, Ringler, Slayton, Schwartz, Young; R. I., Hurst; TEX., McFadin, Bell, Payne, Buchanan, Rhodes; UTAH, Syphers, Leggett; VA., Dennett; WIS., Gaylord, Weber, Thomas, Melms, Berger, Thompson, Tuttle, Heath, Sandburg, Jacobs; WYO., O'Neill.

No:—ALA., Waldhrost; ARK., Perlin, Penrose, LeFevre, Snow; CAL., Woodby; CONN., Schieldge; FLA., Pettigrew; IDAHO, Untermann, Riggs, Chenoweth; IND., Reynolds; IA., Rohrer, Hills; KANS., Katterfeld; MICH., Lockwood; NEV., Miller; N. J., Goebel, Kearns, Krafft, Strobell; N. MEX., Metcalf; TEX., Smith, Thompson; VT., Wilson; W. VA., Houston; WYO., Groesbeck.

Not voting:—ARK., Jones; GA., Wilke; KANS., Brewer; N. Y., Fuhrman; OHIO., Jones, Hayes; OKLA., Reynolds; S. DAK., Atwood, Knowles; TEX., Holman, Clark; WASH., Washington delegation not voting, being interested in the matter.

Absent:—MINN., Rose; MO., Behrens; ORE., Ramp; TENN., Voss.

THE CHAIRMAN: The vote is overwhelmingly in favor of accepting the committee's report. It is four or five to one. If there is no objection, I will announce now that the motion is carried to adopt the report of the Executive Committee relative to the matters in the state of Washington.

Adjourned.

AFTERNOON SESSION

Chairman Slayton called the convention to order at 2 o'clock.

The secretary submitted the report of the vote on the Washington case. The motion to approve the report of the National Executive Committee was carried by a vote of 164 for and 27 against.

The next business being the voting for committees, it was decided that the voting be done by marking a cross before or after the name voted for.

DEL. HILLQUIT (N. Y.) moved to take a recess to enable the ballots on the committees to be gathered by

the tellers for the purpose of counting.

The motion was seconded and carried and a recess was taken.

The convention was called to order at 2:30 P. M.

ASST. SEC. STRICKLAND: I have a telegram here. If there is no objection I will read it at this time.

"Baltimore, Md.

"Socialist Convention, Brand's Hall, Chicago.

"Resolved, that Theodore Roosevelt be thanked for giving free and unsolicited

advertisement to Socialist propaganda.
"Baltimore Socialists."

ASST. SEC. STRICKLAND: Another telegram:

"New York, May 12, 1908.

"Chairman Socialist Party Convention,
Brand's Hall, Chicago:

"Russian American Social Democratic League sends brotherly greetings, and wishes successful work for the emancipation of labor."

A recess was taken for the counting of ballots.

The convention was called to order again about 5 P. M.

MESSAGE FROM COMRADE SARAH A. BIGELOW.

ASST. SEC. STRICKLAND: While the comrades are being called from the ante rooms, I have a message to read to the comrades in this convention. It will take no time if we read it while the delegates are quietly taking their seats. Here is a message from the mother of George Bigelow. Mrs. Bigelow, widow of our comrade, George Bigelow, deceased, is with us today and sends us this message. I read it because you perhaps can best hear it. Comrade Mrs. Bigelow is at my right by the platform. The mother of George E. Bigelow, now over 80 years old, sends this message to this convention:

"It is my hope to live long enough to see the ultimate triumph of this cause, to which my only child gave the best years of his life. His great heart broke because of the pain of the world. My house is left unto me desolate, but all the world are my brothers and God will take care of me. Your comrade, Sarah A. Bigelow," (Cheers.)

DEL. SPARGO: I move that that letter be referred to the Resolutions Committee when it shall be declared elected, and that they be instructed to frame a suitable reply on behalf of this convention. (Seconded.)

DEL. BERGER: I move to amend that instead of referring this to the Committee on Resolutions we send back a telegram and that we instruct our secretary to do so right away.

THE CHAIRMAN: It can be sent by messenger as she is in another part of the city.

The motion as amended was carried unanimously.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF VOTE ON COMMITTEES.

THE CHAIRMAN: The secretary is ready to begin reading the reports on the delegates elected to the various committees.

The secretary then read the complete list of committees, which, after comrades elected to more than one committee had chosen which they would serve upon and the next highest had been substituted, were as follows:

Committee on Women and Their Relationship to the Socialist Party.—Mila Tupper Maynard, Antoinette Konikow, Gertrude B. Hunt, Winnie E. Branstetter, Josephine R. Cole, Laura B. Payne, Marguerite Prevey, Sol Fieldman, Grace D. Brewer.

Auditing Committee.—Mark Peiser, D. K. Young, W. L. Garver, W. W. Buchanan, George E. Boomer.

Committee on Constitution.—Winfield R. Gaylord, B. Berlyn, J. E. Snyder, Caleb Lipscomb, H. L. Slobodin, W. J. Bell, Kasper Bauer, A. G. Fenton, Fred Krafft.

Committee on Resolutions.—John Spargo, C. H. Kerr, Elizabeth H. Thomas, Edward Moore, J. C. Rhodes, Benjamin Wilson, M. Kaplan, Alfred Wagenknecht, Squire E. Putney.

Committee on Labor Organizations.—Algernon Lee, Robert Bandlow, Frank J. Weber, Grant Miller (Nev.), G. A. Hoehn, T. J. Morgan, James D. Graham, James H. Maurer, S. M. Reynolds.

Committee on Foreign Speaking Organizations.—U. Solomon, Antoinette Konikow, Louis Goaziou, Ester Nieminen, S. A. Knopfnagel.

Committee on Farmers' Program.—Carl D. Thompson, J. G. Wills, Seymour Stedman, E. L. Rigg, E. J. Rohrer, J. C. Thompson, C. W. Barzee.

Committee on Ways and Means.—G. W. Davis, F. L. Schwartz, W. M. Brandt, Charles Sandburg, Julius Gerber, Harriet D'Orsay, T. L. Buie, M. A. Smith, E. W. Perrin.

Committee on Press.—May Wood Simons, J. W. Slayton, W. A. Jacobs, Ida Crouch Hazlett, Ellis O. Jones.

Committee on Government by Commission.—(This committee was increased from five to seven.) John Hagel, Isaac Cowan, George Ambrose, Howard Tuttle, J. O. Bentall, W. C. Hills, Gustave Strebel.

COMMUNICATION.

The following telegram was read:

"New York, May 12, 1908.—National Convention, Socialist Party, Brand's Hall, Chicago: The Executive Committee of the Jewish Bund in America sends its hearty congratulations to the National Convention of the Socialist Party of America. We express our earnest desire to see a powerful united Socialist Party in this classic land of capitalism. (Signed) Executive Committee, Jewish Bund of America." (Applause.)

PHOTOGRAPH OF DELEGATES.

An announcement was made that a photograph of the delegates would be taken in front of the Art Institute, Thursday morning, at 9 o'clock. (On account of rain Thursday morning, the photograph was not taken until Friday morning.)

The convention then, at 6 o'clock, adjourned for the day.

FOURTH DAY'S SESSION

Secretary Barnes called the convention to order at 10 o'clock.

Del. Stedman, of Illinois, was elected chairman for the day.

COMMUNICATIONS.

Des Moines, Iowa, May 13.—Socialist Party National Convention: Accept our congratulations, and we wish you great success in all your undertakings. (Signed) Branch Workmen's Circle, 107.

Schenectady, N. Y., May 12.—National Convention Socialist Party, Brand's Hall: May your motives be undefiled, your battles magnificent, your conclusions unanimous and your achievements an inspiration. Yours for economic freedom, Local Schenectady.

Chicago, May 11.—Socialist Convention, Brand's Hall: The Chicago organizations of the Jewish Socialist Territorial Labor Party of America greets the Socialist Convention and wishes it success in the future. (Signed) Jewish Socialist Territorial.

REPORTS.

DEL. STRICKLAND: I wish to announce that the report of Comrade Hillquit, Secretary to the International Socialist Bureau, and the report of Comrade Barnes, National Secretary, are formally noted in printed form. They appear on the desks.

The report of the International Secretary was then read, as follows:
Comrades:

The Socialist movement of the United States is an integral part of the larger movement for the emancipation of the working class of the world. Our party is organically and intimately connected with the Socialist parties of all civilized countries, and we have more than a mere sentimental interest in the fate and progress of our comrades abroad.

The struggles of international Socialism are our struggles, its victories are our victories and its defeats are our de-

feats. It is, therefore, highly appropriate that this national gathering of American Socialists devote a few minutes of its time to a review of the progress and conditions of our movement beyond the boundaries of the United States.

And nothing can be more encouraging and inspiring to the militant Socialists of America than the contemplation of the wonderful development of international Socialism within the last few years.

THE GROWTH OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM.

When we met in this hall just four years ago, the Socialist movement had already asserted itself as a factor of prime importance in the political life of several of the principal countries of Europe, and had taken root in almost all advanced countries of the world. The total number of Socialist voters was at that time estimated at about 6,500,000, and Socialism was represented in the parliaments of fifteen nations by a total delegation of about 250 deputies. But since then Socialism has made marvelous new gains and has grown all along the line. In France the divided Socialist movement has united into one harmonious and strong party; it has increased its vote by about 100,000 and has raised the number of its representatives in parliament from 37 to 54.

In England, the cradle of capitalism, the working classes, who have heretofore been considered impervious to Socialism, have within that period risen in powerful revolt against their exploiters, and have joined the ranks of the international Socialist proletariat. The British workingmen have at this time 32 representatives of their class in the House of Commons, and two-thirds of these are Socialists. In Austria, where our comrades were largely instrumental in winning universal suffrage, the Social Democratic Party in the general elec-

tions of 1907 increased its vote from 780,000 to over 1,000,000, and the number of its deputies from 11 to 87.

But even greater victories than in France, England and Austria, Socialism has scored in that most unfortunate of all countries—Russia. In the vast empire of the Romanoffs, which for centuries has been succumbing to the yoke of an oppressive autocracy, all attempts of the "better classes" to save the country from the savage clutches of its rulers have been futile, and it has remained for the working class, the revolutionary, Socialist workingmen of Russia, to strike the blow which is bound to set their country free. For, notwithstanding the momentary triumph of the reaction, the Russian revolution is not dead, and the Russian workingmen who on January 22d, 1905, consecrated the soil of Free Russia with their blood, are more determined than ever, and they will rise again and again until the last battle between despotism and liberty will have been fought. During the short period of their relative political enfranchisement our Russian comrades elected over 90 deputies to the second Douma, and in the little autonomous dukedom of Finland the Socialists elected 80 deputies out of a total of 200, among them 9 Socialist women.

In Germany in the last general election the combined forces of capitalism and the government waged a campaign of unprecedented fierceness against Social Democracy, and our German comrades lost 36 seats in parliament, but gained a quarter of a million votes.

All told, the international Socialist movement has increased in its voting strength since 1904 from about six million five hundred thousand to between nine million and ten million, and it has raised the number of its deputies in parliament from 250 to over 400. The Socialist movement counts its representatives in the various municipalities of Europe by the thousands, its press is represented in all modern languages and reaches many millions of readers every day.

Socialism has spread to all countries of Europe, with the sole possible exception of Greece; to the United States, Canada, Argentina and Bolivia; to Australia, South Africa, to Japan and even China. "Charles V.," observed our eloquent comrade, Emile Vandervelde, at the Stuttgart Congress, "once said that

the sun does not set in his empire; we Socialists can assert with greater justice that within the countries in which the red banner waves the sun never sets."

THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESSES.

The physical bond between the various movements of Socialism is represented by the International Socialist and Labor Congresses, to which all Socialist organizations and all other labor organizations which recognize the principle of class struggle and political action are admitted. The International Congresses discuss such questions of Socialist principles and methods as are of importance to the movement in all countries, but their resolutions are advisory rather than directive or mandatory.

The Socialist movement of every nation had originally an equal vote in these international councils, but in 1907 these votes were apportioned among the various affiliated parties in accordance with their strength and numbers on a graded scale of 2 to 20.

The Socialists of the United States, in accordance with that plan, were given 14 votes at the last congress.

The first of the new series of these international Socialist conventions was held in Paris in 1889, and it was followed by six more as follows: Brussels, 1891; Zurich, 1893; London, 1896; Paris, 1900; Amsterdam, 1904, and Stuttgart, 1907. And as the Socialist movement grew and extended steadily during that period, so did each succeeding congress excel its predecessors in point of representation and general strength. The first Paris congress was attended by 391 delegates (221 of them Frenchmen), representing 17 countries of Europe and the United States; the Stuttgart congress was attended by about 1,000 delegates, representing 25 distinct countries of all parts of the world.

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST BUREAU.

At the London Congress of 1896 it was resolved to try the experiment of establishing a permanent International Socialist Bureau with a responsible secretary, but the practical realization of the plan was left to the succeeding congress of 1900, which definitely created the bureau and prescribed its functions.

The International Socialist Bureau is composed of two representatives of the organized Socialist movement in each

affiliated country. Its headquarters are located in Brussels, Belgium, and are in charge of a permanent secretary. The bureau is the executive committee of the international congresses, and meets at such times as its business requires. In the intervals between its sessions it transacts its business by correspondence.

During the experimental period of its existence the International Socialist Bureau seemed to hold out but scant promise of accomplishing practical results for the Socialist movement, and the delegates who attended our last national convention will remember the rather pessimistic report of our party's representative on the bureau on that occasion. But within the last few years, and especially since the appointment of its present and gifted secretary, Comrade Camille Huysmans, the International Socialist Bureau has readily adapted itself to the needs of the movement, and to-day it is a useful and important factor in the Socialist movement of the world. It secures and publishes from time to time valuable information on the progress and conditions of the Socialist and labor movements of all countries; it advises on matters of Socialist legislative activity and it organizes the international congresses. The bureau has established an archive of the socialist movement and has collected a library of socialist works, both of which are of the utmost importance to the students of socialism, and finally the Bureau has often served as a medium for mutual assistance between the socialist and labor movements of the different countries. During the period of intense revolutionary activity in Russia, the Socialists of that country received through the Bureau over 150,000 francs.

THE PART OF THE AMERICAN SOCIALIST.

The first representative of the Socialist Party of the United States on the International Socialist Bureau was Comrade George D. Herron, who resigned on account of ill health in the early part of 1905. Since that time I have had the honor to serve on the Bureau as the representative of our party. For obvious reasons I have been unable to participate in the sessions of the Bureau between conventions, but I have always been in active correspondence with its secretary, and have endeavored to the best of my ability to keep the socialists of America posted on the developments of our movement abroad and vice versa. I have also taken part in all sessions of

the Bureau held in conjunction with the conventions of Amsterdam and Stuttgart, and have attended the plenary meetings of the conventions. The reports of these conventions have been submitted to you and need not be recapitulated here.

The delegates of our party have on both occasions performed their duties faithfully and capably, and have earned the respect of their comrades abroad.

Let us now endeavor to invest the socialist movement of the United States with that power and importance to which it is entitled in view of the advanced industrial conditions of our country and the needs of our proletariat, so that we may soon equal, if not eclipse, the glorious achievements of our brothers on the other side of the Atlantic.

Fraternal submitted,

MORRIS HILLQUIT.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your pleasure with the report?

DEL. SPARGO: Comrade Chairman, I move that the report be adopted by the convention, with a recommendation to our party press that they give it the widest possible publicity. (Seconded.)

DEL. KEARNS (N. J.): I move as an amendment that it be made a part of our propaganda material and that it be printed in pamphlet form by the national office. (Seconded.)

DEL. SPARGO: I am willing to accept that.

DEL. SLAYTON (Pa.): I wish to move a further amendment, that in line 14 on the second page the word "women" be inserted after the word "workingmen." Farther down the word "women" is used in connection with the subject of nine deputies having been elected to the congress of Finland. In this particular instance I wish to amend it to read: "All attempts of the 'better classes' to save the country from the savage clutches of its rulers have been futile, and it has remained for the working class, the revolutionary, Socialist workmen and women." (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Maybe that will be accepted by the secretary.

DEL. HILLQUIT: That is acceptable.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Are you ready for the amendment to the amendment?

DEL. WANHOPE (N. Y.): I have just one suggestion to make. The par-

agraph at the end of the second page states that Socialism has invaded every country in Europe with the exception of Greece. I am glad to state that I know for a fact that Socialism has invaded Greece. (Applause.) There was in the last paper I published a report from a local in Greece, which says it has 500 members. (Applause.) I move to add that as an amendment. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: We have three amendments. The comrade moves to amend the amendment by another amendment, but adding Greece.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): I want to say, in behalf of Socialism in Greece, that the Socialists of New York have borrowed their present official emblem, the arm and the torch, from the Socialists of Greece.

DEL. HILLQUIT: I desire to say that I have absolutely no objection to the annexation of Greece. (Applause.) The point of the matter is that Greece is not connected with the International Bureau, and the movement in Greece is not as yet a political factor. I am glad to hear from Comrade Wanhope that the last reports are that there is a strong local somewhere in Greece. I have no doubt whatever but in a short time the Socialist movement in Greece, as well as anywhere else, will be a very important factor, and I have, as I stated, absolutely no objection to taking out that exception.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question on Greece? (Question called for.) All in favor of including it will signify it by saying aye. Contrary, no. The ayes have it and it is so ordered. We now come to the amendment that it be published and circulated as a leaflet.

DEL. SPARGO: The mover of the original motion, asking that it be given wide publicity in the party press, accepted the amendment suggested by Del. Slayton. They are not mutually exclusive and can be included.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then everything is practically embodied in the report; it has all been accepted. Are you ready for the question? (Question called for.) All in favor will signify it by saying aye. Contrary, no. It is carried.

Asst. Sec. Strickland then read the report of the National Secretary, as follows:

NATIONAL SECRETARY'S REPORT.

"Comrades: Since you last assembled in national convention, four comprehensive annual reports, one by Comrade William Mailly, ex-National Secretary, and three by the present incumbent, dealing with the conduct of the national office and containing a review of the acts of all national party committees and national party referendums, have been published and circulated among the membership, the latest dated Jan. 10 last and covering the calendar year 1907. With the subjects thus of record and readily accessible I shall not occupy your time.

"The constitution has been amended by national party referendums in the following particulars. The National Executive Committee and National Committee shall meet when deemed necessary in place of at stated periods of three months for the former and even years other than the presidential campaigning years for the latter. The National Executive Committee and National Secretary are now elected by national party referendum instead of, as formerly, by the National Committee. All amendments to the constitution proposed by the convention are now required to be submitted to the referendum, and in case of a controversy arising in any state as to the validity of the title of its officers, under certain conditions, a referendum is to be conducted by the National Executive Committee.

"The National Committee has elected a committee on platform and a committee on constitution, and the results of their consideration and their recommendations are at your disposal.

"The provision of the constitution authorizing the election, in advance, by the National Committee of a committee 'on rules and order of business' has served its purpose by expediting, to some extent, the business of the convention.

"Section 2 of Article 2 of the constitution reads as follows:

"Any person occupying a position, honorary or remunerative, by the gift of any other political party (civil service positions excepted), shall not be eligible to membership in the Socialist Party."

"The membership qualification therein noted is a bulwark. It stamps our

organization as a thing apart and distinct from all other political parties. Wherever this issue has been raised and the party's position has been maintained it has been a source of strength, and elicited the further confidence of the working class, already nauseated by the vacillating policy and truckling character of reform movements.

"Section 3 of Article 12 of the constitution reads as follows:

"The platform of the Socialist Party shall be the supreme declaration of the party, and all state and municipal platforms shall conform thereto; and no state or local organization shall under any circumstances fuse, combine or compromise with any other political party or organization, or refrain from making nominations, in order to favor the candidate of such other organizations, nor shall any candidate of the Socialist Party accept any nomination or endorsement from any other party or political organization."

"In this connection the fact is pointed out that there is no related section or provision in the constitution for the enforcement of the declarations set forth. 'Anti-fusion' resolutions and rules for procedure were adopted by the National Committee in session in St. Louis, Mo., Jan. 31, 1903, and the National Committee again on May 15, 1905, recurred to the subject. I recommend that the sense of these resolutions or some other provision covering the same purpose, be incorporated in the organic law.

"National Committee motion No. 16, adopted Oct. 22, 1907, and which provided for agitation against the Dick Military Law, was not carried out in the matter of printing a leaflet containing the law and propaganda matter bearing on the subject, for the reason that the advance orders did not warrant the expense. However, the purpose of the motion did not fail, for numerous meetings were held. The subject was presented by active party members to many labor unions and other organizations. The Socialist press gave it considerable attention and prominence, and the supply of this document in the war department at Washington has been exhausted by application from all parts of the nation.

"National Committee motion No. 32, adopted Jan. 14, provided for the issuance of a leaflet upon the crisis. This leaflet was not printed for the same rea-

son before mentioned, and the further fact that while the motion was pending a number of leaflets dealing with the same subject appeared in the principal cities, the product of party locals, and the report of the secretary to the International Socialist Bureau, Comrade Hillquit, with this as a text, was published about the same time.

"Motions by the National Committee have provided for the issuance of 'A Campaign Hand Book for the Impending National Election' and 'The publication of a leaflet showing Injunctions and Court Decisions against Organized Labor during the past two years.' Both of these documents are in course of preparation. Comrade Joseph M. Patterson kindly consented upon request to take charge of the former and Comrade Seymour Stedman of the latter.

THE NEBRASKA CONTROVERSY.

"That which is generally known as the 'Nebraska Controversy' occupied considerable space in the official records and was the subject of six motions by the National Executive Committee, besides occupying the major portion of two sessions of said committee, and resulted in eight National Committee motions. Regarding this subject, I direct your attention to a recital of the facts in the case taken from all the documents then in hand and published in the October issue of the official 'Monthly Bulletin.' This statement has not been assailed by either side to the controversy.

"Based upon Section 9 of Article 12 of the constitution, the amendment to the constitution last adopted, a petition, with upwards of 700 signatures of residents of the state of Washington and addressed to the National Executive Committee is on file in the National office. The petition questions the validity of the title of the officers of that state organization and requests the National Executive Committee to conduct a referendum of the membership of the state upon this subject.

"The apportionment for delegates in the last convention was based upon one delegate for every one hundred party members. One hundred and eighty-four delegates were in attendance. The apportionment for the representation in the present convention is based upon one delegate for every two hundred

party members. The accredited number of delegates is 219.

"The question of a delegate for Local Honolulu, Hawaii, was referred to the National Executive Committee. I am pleased to report that while the subject was pending Local Honolulu, out of consideration for the expense upon the National party, decided not to send a delegate, and transmitted their views in a communication which has been referred to the proper committee.

"The party progress recently noted in New Mexico, North Carolina and Nevada, if continued, should, in the near future, result in taking them out of the unorganized column and provide them a place in the sisterhood of organized states.

"Aside from Hawaii, before mentioned, we have locals or members at large in Alaska, South America, Mexico, the South Sea Islands, the Panama Canal Zone and the Philippines.

"Standing today as we do upon the threshold of a great national campaign, fruitful as never before of opportunities for the working class, there is no small degree of satisfaction in noting the fact that every political time server or representative of capitalism stands trembling with fear for the preservation of the ancient privileges of the possessing class. This is cumulative evidence of our growing strength. A scared enemy is a battle half won.

"At the beginning of the last presidential campaign year, our membership numbered less than 16,000. Today our records and roll contain more than 41,000 members, while 830 new outposts in the form of party locals have been established in as many cities, hamlets and towns, making a total, not counting the numerous branches in large cities, of 2,470 locals attached to the National organization.

"The efforts of the enemy to misrepresent, hamper our growth and suppress Socialism, the signal failure of these efforts and our present party status, heralds the fact to all the world save those purblind by prejudice, that the American political division of the international working class army is a permanent establishment, a self-reliant and indestructible organization groomed for certain victory.

SUMMARY OF THE FINANCES.

"Balance due National Office for dues stamps:

Alabama ...	\$ 23.20	Montana ...	38.70
California ..	70.10	Minnesota ..	1.75
Colorado ..	50.15	Nebraska ...	26.25
Florida	19.95	N. Dakota...	1.25
Illinois	150.00	Oklahoma ..	158.50
Kentucky ..	2.55	Rhode Isl'd..	10.00
Louisiana ..	5.40		
Massachusetts	47.16		\$604.96

"It should be understood that these accounts appeared during the time that the National Office granted dues stamps on credit. The total amount outstanding at the end of the year 1904 was \$1,147.88, and, in fact, it was larger at the time of the adoption of the National Committee motion, which took effect Feb. 1, 1904, and provided that orders for dues stamps should be honored only when accompanied by cash. The provisions of this motion since its adoption have been observed and carried out.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT.

"The National Secretary's financial statement from Jan. 1 to May 8, 1908, inclusive, is as follows:

Receipts.

Balance on hand Jan. 1.	\$ 565.47
January	2,187.03
February	3,447.46
March	3,650.23
April	6,413.59
May (8th, inc.)	2,650.25
	<hr/>
	\$18,914.03

Expenditures.

January	\$2,034.67
February	2,932.96
March	2,330.35
April	1,988.40
May	1,651.08
	<hr/>
	\$10,937.46

Balance on hand May 8.	\$7,976.57
Outstanding accounts	604.96

Total balance	\$ 8,581.53
Liabilities	516.26

Total cash resources.....	\$ 8,065.27
---------------------------	-------------

SPECIAL ASSESSMENT STAMPS.

"A statement of special assessment stamps up to and including May 8, is as follows:

Alabama	\$ 27.45
Alaska	1.00
Arkansas	164.45
California	497.70
Colorado	195.65
Connecticut	92.00
Delaware	7.00
Florida	42.40
Georgia	16.45
Idaho	156.80
Illinois	412.70
Indiana	114.75
Iowa	191.80
Kansas	200.90
Kentucky	26.60
Louisiana	43.40
Maine	35.25
Maryland	12.60
Massachusetts	153.65
Michigan	193.80
Minnesota	330.95
Missouri	364.00
Montana	125.00
Nebraska	40.60
Nevada	40.60
New Hampshire	39.55
New Jersey	369.60
New Mexico	31.80
New York	300.00
North Carolina	19.25
North Dakota	54.60
Ohio	304.50
Oklahoma	615.65
Oregon	185.00
Pennsylvania	269.50
Rhode Island	66.00
South Dakota	76.30
Tennessee	29.75
Texas	344.25
Utah	50.00
Vermont	9.10
Virginia	11.90
Washington	225.00
West Virginia	51.10
Wisconsin	457.55
Wyoming	134.05
Members at large	11.10

\$7,143.05

TO PAY DELEGATES' FARE.

"The special assessments to pay the railroad fare of delegates to the National Convention is provided for in the constitution. By National Committee

motion the amount of the assessment and the period within which it should be collected was decided. A part of the motion reads as follows: 'Stamps are to be sold to state organizations or locals and members at large in unorganized states on credit, the state organization, etc., to return all stamps not used in levying the assessment and to be responsible for, and pay for all stamps not returned.'

"Owing to the prevailing general condition of unemployment it was believed at an early date to be impossible to meet the entire liabilities on this account by the sale of the assessment stamps, and a supplementary National Committee motion, providing for collection to be taken by each local to assist in paying the mileage expenses, was adopted on April 21. At this late day there appeared no practicable method to secure results other than by direct communication with the locals from the National Office. This course was pursued, and at the same time an explanation was made to the state secretaries and their concurrence in the plan requested. Within the few days intervening between the issuance of the call and the closing of this report the receipts on this account were \$191.16, a most gratifying showing.

"In preparation for the campaign data regarding speakers and literature wanted has been gathered from the locals, while no set plan has been decided upon, the material in hand will be a valuable guide in mapping out the general plan of campaign.

"The National Finnish Translator, Comrade Watia, will present a report, and his recommendations relating to the conduct of that office I heartily indorse. For the very important subject of the relations of the foreign speaking organization with the national party I bespeak your earnest and serious consideration.

"For the right of free speech and a free press our party is generally recognized as holding the vanguard position, battling for their maintenance. The disfranchisement of a large number of the working class by the operation of state primary laws is a closely related question, and a plan should be devised or a policy decided upon for the systematic handling of both these questions.

"I take pleasure in expressing my

heartily appreciation of the valuable assistance and co-operation rendered by Comrades W. W. Rihl, Franklin H. Slick, Marguerite Flaherty, Bertha Cap-pels, Chas. Drees and James H. Brower, who assisted for a longer or shorter period in discharging the various duties devolving upon the office of the National Secretary.

"Into your hands, comrade delegates, is committed the greatest trust ever reposed in any body by the conscious members of the working class of this continent. Their hopes, their aspirations, rest with you. Under present-day conditions a working class political party is a necessity. The Socialist Party is that party. Under any, under all conditions, a vote for capitalism indorses its every crime. Our aim, the abolition of wage slavery, the human race emancipated. In the words of another, 'Our children will surely see it, and we, too, if our faith and works deserve it.'

"Fraternally submitted,

"J. MAHLON BARNES,
"National Secretary."

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your pleasure with the report?

DEL. SHANK (Iowa): I move you, now that the report has been read, that it be submitted to the Committee on Ways and Means. (Seconded.)

DEL. MAHONEY (Mass.): I move the adoption of the report of the National Secretary. (Seconded.)

DEL. KLENKE (N. Y.): I move, as a substitute for the whole, that the report of the National Secretary be received and the matter pertaining to the Nebraska controversy be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means; that on finance to the Auditing Committee; that referring to the foreign speaking organizations to the Committee on Foreign Speaking Organizations, and the matter referring to free speech, etc., to the Committee on Resolutions. (Seconded.)

DEL. McDEVITT (Cal.): The constitution matters should be referred to the Committee on Constitution.

DEL. KLENKE: I accept that in addition to my motion.

The substitute was carried.

DELEGATES' MILEAGE.

NAT. SEC. BARNES: I wish to announce that at adjournment, by applying

at the national office the delegates can get the cash coming for railroad allowances. The assessments did not provide for sleeping car accommodations—some have charged for these and others have not—and I would like to be instructed in regard to such an account.

A DELEGATE: I should like to inquire of the Secretary if there will be a surplus in the fund.

NAT. SEC. BARNES: I shall be able to announce definite figures by the close of this afternoon's session. But I can say now—and it is the most gratifying fact I could announce, I believe—that there are more funds on hand than the liabilities will amount to.

DEL. MAHONEY (Mass.): To bring that before the house in regard to the sleeping car accommodations I would move you, Comrade Chairman, that the delegates be paid their railroad fares at the rate of first-class fares, and that does not include sleeping car accommodation.

The motion was duly seconded by several delegates.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the delegates be paid their railroad fares on the basis of first-class tickets.

DEL. BROWN (Wash.): I would like to ask when he said "first-class fares" if that does not shut out the excursion rates.

A DELEGATE: It should be not exceeding a first-class ticket.

DEL. HILLQUIT (N. Y.): I desire the information whether the motion just made contemplates that delegates who have to travel two or three days or even twenty-four hours, are supposed to stay up at night and not sleep?

A DELEGATE: In the interests of the movement, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I wish the delegates would offer amendments to the motion rather than speaking to the motion under guise of asking for points of information.

DEL. HILLQUIT: I move to amend that the railroad fares to be paid the delegates shall include necessary expenses of a sleeping berth.

The amendment was duly seconded.

DEL. FARRELL (O.): I suggest that Comrade Hillquit add to his amendment that the secretary be instructed to use whatever surplus there

may be over and above first-class fares for the expenses of sleeping berths.

DEL. RYAN (Ore.): I believe we have come as far as any of the delegates in this convention, and we are opposed to allowing the sleeping berth to any delegate. We slept in our chairs or paid for our sleeping berth in addition, and if there should be any funds left in the treasury it won't hurt the treasury and we can use it in sending out speakers. Therefore I am in favor of paying only the actual mileage expenses of the delegates and keeping the balance in the treasury for employing our organizers throughout the United States.

DEL. COLE (Cal.): The reason the Socialists pay the fare of the delegates is in order that the poorest men and women in the country can come to the convention if they are chosen, and there is many a man and woman among us who might represent the party well who feel the burden of this extra sleeping berth, and our extra hotel fare in Chicago, as something very heavy; and there are many who will not come for that reason. It is in the interest of democracy that we pay these fares. What right have you if the money has been voted expressly for the purpose of helping the delegates—what right have you to divert that fund for any other purpose, the fund that was collected in the locals—in our local we took up a special collection to help out the delegates—and not for speakers.

DEL. SCHWARTZ (Pa.): I would be in favor of paying for the sleeping car berths provided there were sufficient money to go round for all the delegates. The chances are that there will not be enough for all the delegates, and a poor man who is a working class representative will be satisfied to sleep in the seat.

DEL. ROSS (Okla.): I want to say to this convention that Oklahoma has a delegation of twelve. Oklahoma has paid six hundred and fifteen dollars and some odd cents for special due stamps which the constitution says shall pay the delegates' carfare to and from this convention. We did not have any sleepers and we do not want any money to pay for sleepers; and I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that the only man who has asked for it is from the largest

delegation and that delegation has not paid half as much as Oklahoma.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT (Wash.): I admire the spunk of our comrades. The Washington delegation has come a little farther than the Oregon delegation. We met the Oregon delegation and the old farmers and their wives have slept in their seats from Portland, Oregon, to Chicago, Illinois. I say that the constitution says that railroad fares only shall be paid, and when the constitution says that railroad fares only shall be paid, it does not mean that you shall buy yourself a two dollar or a three dollar berth in a Pullman; and when the constitution says that railroad fares only shall be paid, it does not mean that you shall spend even one dollar a night for sleeping accommodations. Now, if sleeping accommodations are to be paid for, I should think every comrade would have the right—every comrade who slept in his seat, no matter how far—should have the right to be paid for the inconvenience he has been put to in sleeping in his seat. It is no fun to be waked up two or three times in the night by the conductor looking at your tickets, or to be waked up twenty times by passengers getting off or getting on, or by the conductor asking you to divide your seat with a man who has just got on. The constitution is clear on this subject. The constitution says that railroad fares only shall be paid, and how can you vote to pay for berths when by voting so you vote to violate the constitution?

DEL. DENNETT (Va.): I want to ask this convention of Socialists whether they think the working class money should be spent for palace car accommodations. We have paid for those stamps in Virginia, and whatever surplus there is should go into the national funds for propaganda purposes. I move that the surplus over railroad fares be appropriated for the propaganda of the Socialist movement.

DEL. PEISER (N. Y.): A point of information.

Cries of "Question."

DEL. PEISER: I want to know whether New York did not pay more than three hundred dollars.

NAT. SEC. BARNES: Not until the close of the report on the eighth, and I think not since.

A DELEGATE (Cal.): A point of information. I wish to know from the secretary if California has not paid more than \$497.

The original motion was carried.

PARTIAL REPORT OF RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE.

DEL. SPARGO (N. Y.): The Resolutions Committee is ready at this time to make only a partial report, but do so for the sake of expediting the business of the convention. There was referred to our committee by a very slender majority of one, ninety-three to ninety-two, the proposed telegram which was read to the convention, and which has been before you in the papers, to be sent to the Western Federation of Miners, and the Resolutions Committee in going over that proposed telegram recommend that it be sent to the Western Federation of Miners, as proposed by Delegate Miller, without any alteration. On behalf of the committee I so move.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor will say Aye; opposed, No. It is carried unanimously.

BILLS AND ORDINANCES.

DEL. SPARGO: I have this resolution to offer: "Whereas, It is essential that all bills and ordinances introduced by Socialists before all legislative bodies should be accessible to all Socialists throughout the country to aid them in constructive legislation, therefore, be it resolved that we recommend to the National Executive Committee that it make provisions to have and keep on file all bills and ordinances introduced by Socialists in legislative assemblies, and furnish copies thereof on request at cost."

I move the adoption of that resolution.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

A DELEGATE: I wish to amend by making it read that provision shall be made by the Executive Committee to furnish copies to each state secretary.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any one can get it under that resolution.

THE DELEGATE: I mean that it shall be the duty to forward it to the state secretary.

DEL. SPARGO: The committee responds to that by saying that it is re-

garded as a somewhat inefficient procedure and that the state secretaries are not always the best persons to have them and it is better to lay down the definite principle that any member of the party who is interested will know exactly where he can get the copies of the documents.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor of the resolution as read will signify it by saying Aye. All opposed, No. The ayes have it, and the resolution is adopted.

STATE AND LOCAL CANDIDATES.

DEL. SPARGO: A resolution: "Whereas, It is essential that the full strength of the Socialist Party should at an early date be actively organized for the impending campaign, and to effectively perfect its organization it is essential that the state and local candidates should be nominated at an early date; therefore, Be it resolved that it is the sense of this convention, and it hereby recommends, that the state and local organizations nominate as speedily as possible all state and local candidates."

I so move.

The motion was duly seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor will say Aye. Opposed, No. It is carried unanimously.

LETTER TO PRESIDENT OF U. S.

DEL. SPARGO: At the first session of the convention there was submitted as a matter of personal privilege by Delegate Hoehn of Missouri an open letter to the Chief Magistrate of the country, Theodore Roosevelt. It was proposed by Delegate Hoehn that this convention should depart from its ordinary business to send such a letter to President Roosevelt. As it was neither a matter of personal privilege nor a matter of urgency it was, as we think, properly ruled out at that time by the chairman of that session. Now that open letter so proposed has been submitted to the Committee on Resolutions and we have considered the matter carefully. It is a voluminous statement which, in our judgment, if read at this convention so as to become a part of our proceedings would subject our whole Socialist movement to great ridicule. Therefore, we ask, in

view of the absolutely impossible nature of this document, sending a statement to the President of the United States which would make a laughing stock of this convention and of the party which we represent, the Committee on Resolutions ask that it be killed without even being read to the convention.

DELEGATES: No. Read it.

A DELEGATE: No star chamber.

DEL. SPARGO: The committee also wishes to say that leave to withdraw the document is at the disposition of the gentlemen who submitted it, and I say frankly that in my experience I have never read such an absolutely preposterous statement as this document which I hold in my hand.

DELEGATES: Read it.

DEL. HOEHN (Mo.): In the first place, I did not insist that the committee should bring in a favorable report. I handed this document to the chairman of this committee with the request to look it over and told him that it was the document that was not permitted by the chairman at the first session of the convention. But since the chairman of the committee has made such a decided statement, and since the committee has not seen fit to even ask me to appear before the committee and present my side, and since the committee had the matter in its hand perhaps only an hour or so, I now insist that the document be read to the convention, and therefore move that the document be now read to the convention.

DEL. TUTTLE (Wis.): I second the motion. I don't believe in setting a precedent here and taking away from the comrades anything until they have an opportunity to know what it is. I don't believe in any autocratic business of any kind in a Socialist convention. Nor do I believe in the judgment of any committee being set above the judgment of this body. I want at least to have the letter read—you need not be afraid of us.

DEL. BROWER (Ill.): In common justice to the delegate from Missouri I insist on this matter being taken out of the hands of the Committee on Resolutions and put in the hands of a special committee. It is not in the province of the chairman of any committee appointed by this convention to bring such statements on this floor without giving the man chiefly interested a chance to

be heard. It would be undemocratic and unsocialistic; and I am opposed to that sort of procedure.

DEL. TUTTLE: It is already out of the hands of that committee and on the floor; and we don't want it to go to another committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: Upon the request of any delegate any paper before the house may be read.

DEL. BRANDT (Mo.): It ought to be read.

THE CHAIRMAN: The request has been made and if it is insisted upon, it will be read.

Cries of "Read it!"

DEL. BRANDT: It is necessary to read the document.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chairman of the committee has risen to read the document.

A DELEGATE: I move to lay this whole matter on the table.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Spargo has the floor to read.

DEL. SPARGO: Let me preface the reading by this statement. The Committee on Resolutions had the power presumably to keep the matter entirely from the convention. The Committee on Resolutions decided that it was not an autocratic body. It expresses its opinion to the convention, and although you have the right to have it read if you wish, the committee recommended that it should not thus be made a part of our proceedings. If you rule otherwise and say that you don't agree with that, the committee is perfectly willing to have the matter read before the convention.

DEL. BROWER: I rise for information. I want to ask the chairman of the committee if the statement of the delegate from Missouri is true that he was not even asked to appear before the committee when the committee was making its decision?

DEL. SPARGO: The statement that he was not asked to appear before the committee is partly true—it was no discourtesy to the delegate from Missouri, but due to the demand from the convention that you have some kind of a report from the committee.

DEL. TUTTLE: I wish to move an amendment.

DEL. HOLMAN: There is a motion before the house to read that document. That motion was duly second-

ed. Until that motion is put and carried the document ought not to be read. Don't read it if you want to carry out parliamentary law.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is hardly a point of order. You are merely instructing the chairman.

DEL. SPARGO: The proposed letter is as follows:

To President Theodore Roosevelt,

White House,

Washington, D. C.

"Every far-sighted patriot should protest first of all against the growth in this country of that evil thing which is called class consciousness. The demagogue, the foolish Socialist visionary, who strives to arouse this feeling of class consciousness in our working people, does a foul and evil thing."

(From President Roosevelt's Special Message to Congress.

Sir:—

In your latest special message to congress you raise the question of class consciousness. As the highest executive officer of this great American republic you appeal to every far-sighted patriot to protest first of all against the growth in this country of that evil thing which is called class consciousness.

As the president of this republic, occupying the most responsible political position by the will and consent of the majority of the voters of the country, you have consciously or unconsciously insulted hundreds of thousands of law-abiding and patriotic men and women by charging them with the perpetration of foul and evil acts, because they are educating the working people in class consciousness.

Mr. President of this great republic, we beg leave to inform you that you have committed an act of gross injustice to the millions of Socialist citizens, to every Socialist man and woman in this and other countries, and we insist that you owe them a public apology. Even as undesirable citizens, we have the right to demand that whenever you address Congress in a special message on any vital problem of the day you should first properly inform yourself on the subject, in order that you may know what you are talking about.

We Socialist delegates in National Convention assembled take great pride in pleading guilty to the charge of arousing the class consciousness of the

working people. We feel proud to plead guilty for the same reason that Patrick Henry, George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Thomas Paine, and other heroes of the great American Revolution felt proud of their consciousness of American independence from the feudal reign of King George.

Mr. President of the Republic, kindly permit this national convention of "undesirable citizens" to call your attention to the fact that unless the Socialists succeed in educating the working class of this country to a consciousness of their conditions, to a consciousness of their common interest, to a consciousness of the necessity of class conscious co-operation on the political battle field, this country will be thrown into a state of capitalist despotism and anarchy.

You, as the president of this republic, know from your every-day experience that the class rule of capitalism is supreme in the United States Congress, in the United States Senate, and even in the United States Supreme Court; you, as president of this great republic, are acquainted with the fact that our United States Congress has become a mere political clearing house of capitalist class interests. Every just and reasonable demand of organized labor for protective labor legislation has been opposed by the capitalist class and this class opposition found expression in both houses of Congress. The very fact that even the leading conservative labor unions connected with the American Federation of Labor have been forced into the political arena is the most striking proof of the existence of class rule, class government, and class justice.

This capitalist class rule is dictated by capital class interest. Out of these conflicting class interests develops the class struggle between capital and the forces of organized labor.

That this class struggle is not a theory but a real, hard fact, a condition which must be met, you, as president of this republic, have repeatedly pointed out in your official messages to Congress and in your public addresses and speeches. We, the Socialists, are doing no more than you do. We simply attest the existence of the class struggle between capitalism and the working class, but we go one step farther and tell the working class that only by class-conscious action will it be able to bring

about a change in these conditions. Every day the working people are growing more class conscious because they are getting more educated.

Mr. President, does it not occur to you that the man or woman who is not class conscious must be unconscious of the real conditions under which his or her own class of people are suffering? To be conscious of the condition means to know the condition. To be unconscious means not to know the conditions, nor the ways and means to change them.

You, Mr. President, repeatedly demanded from Congress laws for the benefit of the people, but your demands were ignored because the capitalist class interests dominated the law-makers. You know that the United States Congress has become the cemetery for labor legislation. If in place of the political undertakers there were seated in the halls of Congress fifty or one hundred class conscious workingmen and Socialists, every demand for labor legislation made today by you or by organized labor would be enacted into law and no United States Supreme Court would dare to disregard the will of the nation.

By your latest message to Congress, that is, by raising your Don Quixote warning against class consciousness, you have done more towards spreading class consciousness in the ranks of labor than we could accomplish in many, many months of agitation and propaganda.

In order that you may not again show your lack of knowledge on such a vital question as class consciousness, and that you may not repeat your insult to the "undesirable citizens," we hereby instruct our National Secretary, J. Mahlon Barnes, to mail to your address, together with this open letter, a copy of the Communist Manifesto, by Karl Marx, which we hope that you will carefully read, so that you may convince yourself of the fact that even the President of the United States may sometimes be wrong.

Respectfully yours,

SOCIALIST PARTY NATIONAL CONVENTION.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this letter be laid upon the table.

SEVERAL DELEGATES: Second the motion.

DEL. HILLS (Iowa): I want to make the point of order that the chairman has no right to recognize the chairman of any committee that is making a report until he first submits the question to the convention, and asks them what their pleasure is; and he has permitted the chairman of the committee on resolutions to make a motion before submitting it to the convention, and I want that point of order decided.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point of order will be sustained; there is no motion before the house.

DEL. REYNOLDS (Ind.): It seems to me it is time that a letter of this character emanating from the class conscious workers of America should not be designated as preposterous.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any motion—

DEL. REYNOLDS: I move that this letter be adopted by the convention; that it be ordered printed by the National Office, and a copy of it transmitted to the President of the United States, with the Communist Manifesto.

DEL. TUTTLE (Wis.): Second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved by Comrade Reynolds and seconded by Comrade Tuttle that the letter be printed and a copy be sent to the president.

DEL. LEWIS (Ill.): I am opposed to this motion. When we undertake to print and disseminate throughout this country a statement coming from this convention it ought at least to conform to the A, B, C of the Socialist philosophy. I don't propose to go into any extended criticism; but just take one or two points as samples of the rest. Here is a passage that occurs in this document: "The class struggle between capitalism and the working class." Since when did capitalism become a class? The capitalist class is a class, but "capitalism" is not the name of any class. This is the kind of language that with an A, B, C knowledge of the Communist Manifesto referred to in this document would have been impossible. But this occurs again and again. "The class struggle between capitalism and the forces of organized labor." Statements of this description do no credit to the delegate from Missouri who presents them.

I object further to this convention

referring in terms of adulation to men like George Washington, and referring to the bourgeois revolution of 1776 as if it were an ideal presented on the floor of this convention of what we wish in the future as a Socialist revolution.

When we send any statement to the president of this country, to be disseminated, as it naturally would be, through the press of America, it should at least be carefully revised, and it should be written by scholars, at any rate, who will not confuse a state of society with a class.

Let me develop that point. In the city of San Francisco, as the delegates from California know, we had trouble on this very point. We had a speaker on our platform who refused to recognize the class struggle—and if this document does not deal with the class struggle, what does it deal with?—we had to instruct him—at least this was the decision we arrived at—to instruct him to recognize the class struggle in his speeches, or get off the platform. I know, of course, that that was a foolish way to deal with such a question. In order to comply with those instructions he explicitly said, "I believe in the class struggle, not between the capitalist class and the working class, but between capitalism and the working class," a piece of subterfuge, inane, meaningless, but to have that subterfuge and that inanity transplanted to this document and then sent out as a statement by nearly three hundred of the alleged picked intelligence of the Socialist movement of America would disgrace this assembly.

DEL. HOEHN: I shall not attempt to enter a debate with the previous speaker as to the meaning of capitalism and the class struggle. But just take this fine point that is made about capitalism and the working class, or the class struggle between labor and capitalism—take any Socialist paper and in almost every issue you will read about this struggle of organized labor against capitalism. Now, all at once we find that some great professor of the English language, or some great professor of philosophy, informs us all about capitalism, and the fine difference between capitalism and the capitalist class.

He has not made a single remark as to the substantial merits of the document. If the document can be improved in language I have no objection to that.

I have never been fool enough to believe that whatever I say is the best that can be done. But I don't care if I were the only one in this hall today who would stand up for this document, I would not mind it, and I would stand up for it.

DEL. SHANK (Iowa): A point of order. The comrade is not using good grammar.

DEL. HOEHN: The point of order is well taken.

DEL. KEARNS (N. J.): I would request that all the delegates accord Delegate Hoehn the privilege of stating his case without interruption. Those interruptions are not fair.

THE CHAIRMAN: The comrade understands the situation, I think.

DEL. HOEHN: I hope you will pay as close attention to me as you did to the people who have the monopoly of fine language. It is not always the man with the fine language who makes the revolution, mind you. It is the great rank and file who are out on the battle field that have to do the fighting, that make the revolution. It is not always the great philosopher of socialism who knows most about the class struggle. He may think he knows. But it is the great rank and file who are out on the battle field that have to fight the class struggle; and they know a little about it, too.

I challenge each and every delegate on the floor of this convention to show me where there is a single sentence in that document that is not true.

DEL. LEWIS: I will tell you.

A DELEGATE: I will answer that.
SEVERAL DELEGATES: I'll tell you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Hoehn has the floor.

DEL. HOEHN: I challenge you to show me a single sentence or statement in that document that is not a fact.

The first fact is that the Socialist movement of America has been insulted by the President of the United States. When he says that the class conscious Socialists of this country are committing foul acts I say it is an insult. And if these great philosophers will stand such statements and submit quietly to such insults I shall protest against it. The trouble is there are some people here who are afraid to come out and tell the facts in plain language as they are.

Only a few minutes ago you sent a telegram to the Western Federation of Miners. That telegram contained a protest against sending the federal troops to Alaska. Those federal troops were sent to Alaska for the purpose, the express purpose, of breaking up the Western Federation of Miners. But who sent the troops to Alaska? It was President Roosevelt. And that same man did a foul act against the Socialist movement of America when he claimed that the class conscious workingmen are committing foul acts by advocating the developing of class consciousness.

I say to you: Do as you please with this document. I believe in every line that is contained in it. I shall stand for it, I shall vote for it, and it matters not how many of you may vote with me.

DEL. TUTTLE (Wis.): I want it understood why I seconded that motion. I stated to you that I did not want it tabled. I wanted discussion upon it, and when I got up to second that I did so in order that we might have discussion upon it, and then vote intelligently.

I am not in favor of going out after every yellow dog and labeling it and saying: "He is not a Socialist." I am not in favor of dividing our efforts and going off and hitting this man here and the president there; but I want this matter discussed here, and I reserve the right after we are through to vote it down if I want to do so, even though I seconded it.

I seconded that motion to bring out all the points for and against it. I heard those things that were said there about George Washington, and the fathers of our country, Thomas Jefferson and Thomas Paine, and I am not at all bothered by any of those things. I understand this movement. You need not be at all worried about it. I understand it perhaps as well as any man upon this floor, and I am not worried about any of those things.

I thought when I seconded this motion that you would be able to vote intelligently after discussion, and I think you will be able to do so by the time you get through, because I see there are a lot of you who are going to explain it all to us.

DEL. BROWER (Ill.): I am opposed to the motion. I think that the committee, if it had wanted a fight on

this matter, could not have taken more pains to get that discussion than they did in the way they presented their report.

I am not in favor of this convention sending any communications whatever in the name of the Socialist Party of America to Theodore Roosevelt. The convention, if it sent a resolution or letter to Theodore Roosevelt, would simply vitalize the dirty, pusillanimous statement that we are "undesirable citizens" engaged in "foul work" when we struggle to lift the great labor class into the dignity and full expression of democracy.

I am opposed to the motion and any expression going out of this convention to Theodore Roosevelt, but I want it understood that no committee reporting to this convention in the future will bring in such a statement regarding any matter before it, without giving the man or woman who offered the resolution, or whatever the subject matter of the report is, an opportunity to be heard. And if the committee has a doubt as to whether or not the matter should be brought before the convention they shall hesitate before they make such statements as have been made here.

DEL. WINNIE E. BRANSTETTER (Okla.): It seems to me that the spirit of this letter is—well, I am not sure whether it is the spirit of earnestness or the spirit of sarcasm. If it is the spirit of sarcasm, then I say the Socialist Party of the United States is not in any position to consider any question of sarcasm. If, however, it is written in the spirit of an earnest endeavor to educate Theodore Roosevelt, then I say it is entirely out of order, and that we are gathered here for a great deal more important purpose than the education of any one man in the United States.

The document is a very good document, but it has no place in this Socialist convention. If we desire to send a manifesto or an open letter to Theodore Roosevelt, then I submit that a committee of this convention, or the convention itself in committee of the whole or in the proper parliamentary manner, is fully capable of formulating such a manifesto and sending it forth. We do not need any document that has been prepared previously to the meeting of this convention. We are entirely capable of doing those things right here dur-

ing the eight or ten days we will be here.

I have nothing against the comrade from Missouri, and am rather prompted to admire the revolutionary spirit that prompted the writing of that letter, but the comrade has simply made a mistake in putting it before this Socialist convention. It would look beautiful printed in some of our propaganda papers, or possibly in a pamphlet, but we do not want it to go forth from the Socialist Convention to bring ridicule upon the convention and upon the Socialist Party.

DEL. FRAENCKEL (Ill.): I want to say that President Roosevelt is the first president of this country that has had the spunk, or courage enough, to come out and say what he thinks about the Socialists. All the other presidents have had a tendency to hide somewhere and were afraid to tackle us. We must at least give Roosevelt the credit of coming out and not being afraid to say what he wishes to say.

I am in favor of doing something with

this document. We have arrived at the point where we must decide. Shall we assume the policy of the other side? Shall we take up the gauntlet to public discussion? Now I do not know whether it would be the best policy to answer him or not. But I do know that something must be done. I know that we must answer one way or the other. President Roosevelt has invented a new word—"undesirables"—and he may invent another new word, and I don't want a new word to go by default. We need new words. We need new expressions. I believe something should be done along the line of sending him a letter of another description—something where we might have the chance to reach him first, and he might not be able to coin a new word about us. So I believe this letter should be sent. I believe that letter should be sent just as quick as we can reach him, because by the time the convention is over we shall not be able to reach him.

(Adjourned until 2 P. M.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

The convention reconvened at 2 o'clock.

COMMUNICATIONS.

"Kemmerer, Wyo.

"W. L. Mead, care Socialist Headquarters, Chicago, Ill.

"Citizens' ticket 79, and Socialist, 50.

(Signed) "A. P. Roberts,
"Secretary."

"Eastport, N. J.

"Dr. Antoinette Konikow, Delegate to Socialist National Convention, Brand's Hall.

"Socialist Women's Society, Branch 6, Elizabeth, send their heartiest wishes to National Convention of the Socialist Party at Chicago."

"Waterbury, Conn.

"Convention, Erie and North Clark Sts., Chicago.

"Congratulations to convention of Socialist Party. Hurrah for unity!"

"National Convention Socialist Party, Brand's Hall.

"The Chicago Lettish Social Democratic Society sends hearty greetings to National Convention and hopes that the comrades will spend some time considering the immigration question, so important to Socialists from foreign lands."

"Chairman Socialist Convention.

"Comrades, greeting. We profess to believe in the equality of the sexes. Let us make good by giving a woman a place on the ticket. Yours for revolution,
Camille Kipley."

"Socialist Convention.

"Scandinavian Karl Marx Club, Chicago, in meeting assembled at first anniversary, sends greeting to your convention, wishing you great success in your valuable work for the freedom of the working class.

(Signed)

(Signed) "W. P. F. Ilsen."

LETTER TO PRESIDENT OF U. S.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will proceed to the discussion of the motion before the house. I would like to say this, that it has been suggested during the noon hour by several delegations that there are some states that have not been heard from at all. After recognizing two, if you ask for the floor I shall try to recognize those from different delegations first, until we cover those from the different delegations. I will try not to recognize two from one delegation unless it is the sense of the house to do otherwise.

DEL. FIELDMAN (N. Y.): Mr. Chairman and Comrades, when the chairman of the Resolution Committee stated that this letter was preposterous and therefore ought not to be brought before this convention I really thought that it would be wasting our time in giving it any consideration, because I have known Comrade Spargo for a long time and I have always found him very clear in almost everything that I have known him to be connected with. But I do believe that in this case Comrade Spargo did make a mistake. Particularly was he mistaken when he labeled this document as a preposterous document. Even though there are grammatical errors in this document—and there are, and I believe that the writer admits it, he admitted that to us—yet that is no proof that the document as a whole is preposterous or that it is not deserving of careful consideration.

It has been stated on this floor by a number of speakers that this convention ought not to address itself to Theodore Roosevelt. I want to call your attention to the fact that all through the world the revolutionary movement does address itself, both singly, that is, through its subdivisions, and collectively, to the official heads of the various countries that they find themselves in. Some of the very finest means of agitation in Russia are documents that are addressed to the czar personally by the revolutionists of Russia. (Applause.) That is not only because as they are drawn up they speak from the hearts of the bleeding working class of Russia, but because they speak to a man whose name attached to a document causes universal attention. Now, what is true of the czar of Russia is true of Theodore

Roosevelt in this country. (Applause.) Theodore Roosevelt, in the attack that he has made upon class consciousness and the Socialist movement, the labor movement in general, addressed himself not only to the Congress of the United States, but to the United States, the people as a whole of this country, and therefore we that believe we represent the interests of the working class of America are justified and it is necessary that we should address ourselves to the official head of the United States. (Applause.) My dear comrades, the time has come in this country when it is absolutely and unqualifiedly necessary that the Socialist movement should point out to the working class of this country that still believe in the Terrible Teddy and are still swayed by him or any other official in this country—that we should point out to them once and for all time that even though a man is president of the United States, yet he is not above speaking from ignorance on a question of such importance as Socialism. We know that Theodore Roosevelt, in the speeches he makes, in the messages that he addresses to Congress, discusses Socialism nor as a man who has given it thought, not as a man who has given it ample consideration, even though it be a biased consideration, but as a man that has given it no thought at all, that has not investigated the question, not even from the A, B, C point of view. It is up to us, the convention of the Socialist Party of America, to point out to the working class and to the people of the United States that the President of the United States is ignorant about Socialism (applause), and that he attacks it not only because he is opposed to it from class interest, but because he does not know what he is talking about, and we have got to meet him. (Applause.) Therefore, Mr. Chairman and comrades, I am in favor of electing a special committee; that that committee might be charged with the responsibility not only of editing this manifesto or document or whatever you wish to call it, but of substituting it with something better if they can get one up that is better. (Applause.) But let us not neglect this. Anything that we as a convention address to the president of the United States will command the attention of every reading

man and woman in the United States. (Applause.) And therefore it is very necessary that we should carefully, in a dignified spirit and style, if you please, draw up a clear statement of what we stand for, address that statement to the President of the United States, and serve notice upon him that we are not responsible for his ignorance and that we are not going to overlook it. (Applause.) Such a document coming from the convention of the Socialist Party of America and addressed to the President of the United States will command more attention than any book or pamphlet that is now in existence. (Applause.) And it is for this reason that we should take this action.

The platform of the party commands attention, and it is an open letter to every man, woman and child in the United States. But inasmuch as the President of the United States has attacked us and is attacking the working class, and he does it ignorantly, it is up to the working class to take up the gauntlet and make him eat his own words. (Applause.) Comrades, Theodore Roosevelt as a person, as an individual, does not deserve our collective attention. But Theodore Roosevelt as the President of the United States does command and should command our attention. (Applause.)

Have we not addressed ourselves to the president before? There is not a local in the Socialist Party of America that has not adopted resolutions that were addressed to Theodore Roosevelt as a man and President of the United States. There is not a single local in the Socialist Party of America that is not eager to make the president realize the responsibility of his position as President of the United States. We have done it in the Haywood case, and we are ready to do it and should do it in this case. (Applause.) Therefore, comrades, let us act wisely on this question. Let us get up a document that is above criticism so far as grammatical errors are concerned. Let us get up a document that shall fully and clearly state the position of the Socialist Party and the Socialist movement of the world and the position of the working class, and then say to the president, "Here is our position. Now tell us what you think of it, you ignoramus; find out what we stand for." (Applause.)

Now, because of the action of the chairman of the Resolutions Committee, I am inclined to believe that it would be wise that this convention should elect a special committee, a committee that shall be composed of men who have a possession of or who know not only grammatical laws, but who have ideas in addition to laws. (Applause.)

DEL. BRANDT (Mo.): I am going to make a motion, and I request or ask this question of the chair: Can I preface my motion with what I have to say, or shall I make my motion first and speak afterwards?

THE CHAIRMAN: You can state the object of the motion; you cannot argue it.

DEL. BRANDT: The object of the motion is to create a committee to handle this matter, and my reason for it is this: I sat here in this hall this morning with the rest of the delegates and listened to what a great many of the other delegates thought was one of the most peculiar, wonderful statements or reports made by a committee through its chairman. But to us who were here in this hall four years ago we are not surprised, for we heard the same thing from the same source, and directed at the trade union committee at that time, and if you look over the records of the last convention you will find it there. Comrades and Mr. Chairman, my motion is this:

I move that this matter be referred to a special committee of three. I believe that it should be done that way, for I do say this, and whether it may be liked so much or not I care not. I do say this, that if that matter would go back to the Resolutions Committee, and if the man who presented that proposition would appear before them, I believe that every man in this hall who knows him would lose what respect they have got for him. I do not believe he should go near it after what has happened. And I do say in conclusion, if that committee is elected, that it matters not to me, nor neither will I vote for a scholar, but I want somebody on there who knows what the conditions are, who knows what such a thing as that should be and how it should be attended to. We want it grammatically right, yes, but we want it written grammatically right by people who know what these conditions are and who are suffering by the very person

who attacks them and calls for that letter. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I move you that a special committee of three be elected by this convention to take up that matter and see if that is suitable, or draft something in its place. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded that a committee of three be elected to whom this shall be referred to draft a proper method or a different method.

DEL. JOHNS (Cal.): I am opposed to the motion to refer, as I was opposed to the other motion. From all this outcry against the statements of Theodore Roosevelt showing that he has given some attention to the literature of Socialism, for the purpose, naturally, of knocking Socialism; from all this outcry any one might think that we, the Socialist party, had elected Theodore Roosevelt president and that he had turned traitor to us. (Applause.) Such is not the case. Theodore Roosevelt was elected by the votes of the working class, certainly, but not on any working class program and not pledged to do anything for the working class, but, on the contrary, to do all he could to support the privileges and exploiting power of the master class. Has he failed in any degree? Has he not shown himself intelligent in reading the Socialist literature for the purpose of fulfilling his duties as a capitalist class president in fighting Socialism intelligently? As for this, it seems to be absurd that Socialists sent to a national convention of the party cry out as if they were hurt over a thing like this. The president says: "Every far-sighted patriot"—of course, that is a contradiction in terms, for the basis of patriotism is a narrow view—"every far-sighted patriot should protest first of all against the growth in this country of that evil thing which is called class consciousness." To Roosevelt and his masters certainly that is an evil thing.

We have been told on the floor of this convention that that is an insult to the Socialist party—an insult to us. Has Roosevelt in this accused us of anything that we consider an insult? He has accused us of preaching class consciousness. Are we insulted by that? For my part, when I read that charge I cried out in joy. (Applause.) I was joyous to find that Roosevelt had gone

so far in the study of Socialism as to realize our position, that we are preaching class consciousness and should declare it, and I did not feel insulted. In the first address that I made on this—and it was not the last, and it will not be the last from the soap box on this point—well, I won't say what follows just there, but he spoke of the demagogue; he uses the word "demagogue," and says, "The sinister or Socialist visionary who strives to arouse this feeling of class consciousness in our working people does a foul and evil thing and is no true American." When I read that I said, "Thank you, Theodore Roosevelt, and I accept the compliment." We should be glad, and we should not cry out to Roosevelt as if we were hurt and tell him he has hurt us. He has not; he has helped us by recognizing our own stand on class consciousness and the preaching of class consciousness to the working class; and to cry out to that is to place ourselves in an absurd position. That is the chief objection to doing anything about it at all.

There are many objections to the letter as it is written. For instance, in the appeal to the traditional figures of alleged American liberty; to the cold-blooded, aristocratic George Washington, who threw down every rebellious and really revolutionary spirit that was in advance of his own aristocratic adulation that came from the mob. As to the action of the committee, I disapprove of their coming before this convention and stating that there had been a letter submitted to that committee, that it was bombastic and absurd and speaking of something that they were urging should not be brought before this convention at all. I think they were open to severe criticism. If there were any way to punish that committee without punishing the whole Socialist Party I should be in favor of that punishment, but the Socialist Party should not be punished to the extreme degree that the sending of this letter as an open letter to Theodore Roosevelt would be, for the sake of punishing that committee for what I feel to be ill-advised action. I think we should take no action at all in this convention, but on every soap box in the United States point to this, that we are preaching class consciousness, and that we disagree with Theodore Roosevelt in considering that action a foul and

evil thing. We admit that we are preaching class consciousness, and that is all that Theodore Roosevelt accuses us of doing; that is the act that he accuses us of doing. Do we consider that a foul and evil thing? Does any far-sighted, unpatriotic workingman consider that a foul and evil thing?

DEL. COWAN (Ohio): Mr. Chairman and comrades, I stand in support of the amendment, and I want to pay my respects to the people that ridicule the original article. Unfortunately, I was born about thirty years ahead of my time, and I did not have the advantage of an education; that is the trouble with me.

A DELEGATE: You are all right.

DEL. COWAN: I know as much about grammar as I know about Greece. I have done some agitation. The president of the United States has attacked the principles of Socialism; he has not attacked any particular Socialist. It is the principles, one of the underlying principles of Socialism, class consciousness. As the speaker from New York states, we ought to make a reply. Now, I am not particular what the reply is so long as it is fixed up and couched in the right kind of language to suit the critics of the language. (Laughter.) I am not particular about the language. I can pretty near understand any that is spoken along the line I have been taught myself. Why should we at this time reply to the president of the United States? Remember, that you are going to meet men on the road who are not intellectuals. Some of them learn what they do learn in the workshop of life, like myself. I would like to see the intellectuals get down to this document and fix it up right away and make a good one and put it into my hands, so that I would be able to answer it intelligently when we were asked why we didn't answer him. Do you catch on? Do I make myself plain? The fellow that don't know is willing to be taught, and I am one of them. When we go out on the road those questions will arise, and we are now entering a presidential campaign. We are going into one of the greatest fights that the Socialists ever had in the United States, and probably in the world, for that matter. We deal with conditions here; we don't deal with them in any other part of the world. Here is a document; here

is a statement of the president of the United States. He is the president of the whole United States, and he makes an attack on Socialism. We simply sneer; we simply refuse to reply to it. Remember, my friends, he is the chief magistrate, and we probably number all told about a million in the United States amongst the eighty-three or eighty-four million. The people all don't see as we see. Now, we want this document right now. Why? So that I can present it to any audience I may appear before and say, "Here is our reply to the slanders of the president of the United States. I have a document here that I am not ashamed of, and you can read it for yourselves." Now, I can't get up that document, but I am here asking that this committee may be appointed, that the document may be written and that it may be issued. I agree with the comrade from New York that it would be one of the best propaganda documents we will have during this election. There is no question about it. (Applause.) Now, we don't want to abuse the president of the United States. That is simply the tactics of the pettifogger all over, when he has no case, to abuse the opposing attorney. Now, you can take it and put it in English. I don't know much about it, but I say we want to issue it so that the wayfaring man, though a fool in those matters, will not err on this point, that what the Socialists stand for is right and justice and eternal truth. Send it to the president of the United States, who is worshipped and adored by hundreds of thousands, yes, million, of people in the United States, who believe that he is the Moses that is going to lead them out of the wilderness. There are some Moseses in the Socialist party, and we have heard from them in this convention. So I think we had better go to work and post up the capitalists as far as we possibly can. I say I stand here for the appointment of that committee on those lines.

DEL. PAYNE (Tex.): Comrades, the members in this convention are comrades scattered all over the United States. They come from the rank and file of the Socialist Party. After all, the greatest work and the work most worth while is that done by the rank and file of the Socialist Party, the workingmen and the workingwomen on the

farm, in the mill and factory and shop, wherever we find them. And today we are here to express the will of these people, and I am here to say that I am ashamed when one of you gets up and proposes something which expresses his opinion in our convention, that he receives a slap in the face and ridicule, as your comrade from Missouri did. (Applause.) The night is never too dark and it is never too cold or too hot for the comrades to go to get speakers and take them wherever they are to go. When there is a call made on them they go down in their pocketbooks for the funds to carry on the work of Socialism. And then when they come to conventions they are ridiculed because they cannot couch their sentiments in language suitable and that will sound harmonious to these educated delegates, to the ears of those scholars. (Applause.) Now, I like scholarship, but if I have to choose between scholarship and ideas I will take ideas every time. (Applause.) Now, so far as the comrade's communication was concerned, we sat before you and heard it read. If this convention had not risen up as one man almost and said, "We will hear it read," we would never have known what it was. I could scarcely keep from shouting, I was so pleased with the sentiment expressed there. (Applause.) There was nothing that was ridiculous or unreasonable in that. If he made a mistake in the expression when he undertook to mean the capitalist class when he said capitalism, we could understand that. And our comrade over there said that it was the A, B, C of Socialism. Why, there is no use to send any other kind of communication to President Roosevelt.

DELEGATES: Hurrah for Texas! What's the matter with Texas? She's all right, the best in the bunch.

DEL. PAYNE: Now, I do not think there should be any feeling between any of the proletarians and the intellectuals. We should all work together. If a working man from the ranks of labor, or a workingwoman, sees fit to give us something in this convention that will be for the benefit of the Socialist movement, then I say that if it is not couched in terms that we wish to go out all over the world, let some of our intellectuals couch it in such language, and let us not be found giving a slap in the face to one of our worthy comrades. So I close, by

saying that I am in favor of the amendment; I am in favor of submitting this to a committee and of having this sent to the president of the United States (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Before I call on the comrade from Arkansas or recognize him, I want to say this to the convention, that I do not think any one has questioned the judgment or criticized the grammar used in that article.

DEL. JONES (Ark.): Comrades, I have a very profound respect for this convention, first; I have a very profound respect for the individuals of which it is composed. If you will permit, I want to suggest that there is due this comrade from Missouri a vote of thanks for the splendid suggestions couched in the letter which he wrote. I believe that it comes within the province of our essential duty to take up this letter, as has been indicated by this splendid woman who has just addressed us from Texas, and embody the gist of that letter, as she has already said, in language suitable to the "refined and classic air of America," if you please. (Laughter.) This comrade manifests a degree of learning which warrants all in believing he understands the fundamental laws of Socialism. And if you will pardon me for this suggestion, the philosophy of Socialism is so broad, so deep and so wide that it even incorporates the essential interest of every man, not only in this country, but everywhere. The philosophy of Socialism, as I understand it, my friends, is broad enough to take in the tramp at one end of the line and Rockefeller at the other. If you look to the best interests of society, if the ultimate inauguration of the principles of Socialism is what our philosophy teaches us, it is absolutely for all. In our class consciousness we are, if you please, to so organize human society as to bring human society within the limits of the line of its social organic being. Every man, from the manual laborer up to the philosopher, has his position in society and will be taken care of. Is that not correct? In our terms often we are misleading. I do not believe that Socialism means that every man shall become a manual laborer. I believe, my friends, that class consciousness is a very broad term. It does not incorporate only one class of workers, but every class of workers

whose work is identified with the best interests of the social organic being, based upon the principles of the collective ownership and the democratic management of public utilities. That is my understanding of Socialism. And I believe, my friends, that as has been indicated by other speakers upon the floor, this is a very opportune time to issue from this splendid gathering of representatives from different parts of the country a propaganda that will make a demand that is felt, as was indicated by the brother who stood upon the table, everywhere we go. This will meet the demand in a way that will have the appreciation of every comrade throughout the whole country. I believe this comrade has served us as probably no other comrade will be able to do in suggesting a line of action which will contribute to the success of the Socialist party this year. I believe, my friends, that we need to appoint a committee of three or five, and that this committee will from this letter formulate a letter in answer to President Roosevelt in language that is adequate, in language that is duly respectful toward the president of the United States. If there is a people in this country who can speak calmly, dispassionately, in response to the language uttered by the president, it is the Socialist who is well equipped, who understands the philosophy of Socialism. In the language used by the president of the United States he simply challenged the Socialist Party, and the Socialist Party is adequate to the emergency and can reply to his challenge and reply to it in a splendid way. If my time is not up, I wish to yield the floor to the comrade from Missouri.

(Question repeatedly called for.)

DEL. HILLQUIT (N. Y.): Comrades, I shall not detain you long. I wish to say to you, first of all, I regret exceedingly that the tone which has marked the last portion of our debate should have crept into our councils at this time. I think it is very unfortunate. It will not aid our deliberations if we shall attempt to get up some imaginary differences between ourselves instead of defining the difference between the Socialist movement and anything outside of the Socialist movement. (Applause.) I deny that there are two currents here; I deny that there is any antagonism between the so-called intellectuals and the so-called proletarians. I claim that all

members of this convention, no matter from what walk of life they come, have come as Socialists, as representatives of the proletarian movement, and are working and should be working in accord together. (Applause.) The man who makes an appeal on the floor of this convention to any antagonism between ourselves does not serve the cause of Socialism. (Applause.)

I am opposed to this letter. I am opposed to the appointment of a committee. I am opposed to any official communication being sent by this national convention of the Socialist Party to Theodore Roosevelt, arguing with him points of theory on the Socialist program. (Applause.) I think it is undignified; I think it is illogical; I think we do a very ridiculous and childish act if we do so. Now, comrades, it is easy to be carried off your feet by a phrase, and it is easy to get excited for a moment and commit an act of indiscretion. We are brought here to deliberate and not to be swayed by superficial sentiment. (Applause.) What sense, I ask you, does the adoption of such a letter have? If this convention had decided to address President Roosevelt as the representative of the national government on certain grievances, with a certain petition to him as the representative of the national government, I might understand it. But what we are asked to do is to enter into a discussion with him on a theoretical subject, and that I say we are not called upon to do. And I say more: Theodore Roosevelt as a theoretician, as a social scientist, is not worthy of your attention. (Applause.) Why a letter to Theodore Roosevelt? Why not pick out some statement ignorantly made of every politician, every so-called statesman, from village constable up to the president of the United States, and send open letters from the convention to each and every one of them and discuss matters with them? If a letter is to be addressed to Theodore Roosevelt, why on this particular question? Because he happened to speak about it or write about it a couple of weeks ago, and because Comrade Hoehn happened to remember it? He has done other things during his term of administration. Is not Theodore Roosevelt the man who on the eve of a very important trial branded the defendant as a criminal and an undesirable citizen? Won't you write a little com-

munication on that account? (Applause.) Why not write a little letter to the Supreme Court of the United States about their decisions and discuss the law with them? (Applause.) Why not write a letter to John D. Rockefeller and have a heart-to-heart talk with him about his length of life?

Comrades, in our declaration of principles, in our platform, in our resolutions, we state the stand of the Socialist Party, and I say we have absolutely no business, without making ourselves ridiculous, to get out a sarcastic letter, even if it be excellently worded, discussing with Theodore Roosevelt a phase of his message. Now, mind you, Comrade Hoehn might do it; Comrade Spargo might do it; every one of you might do it. Publish it in your papers; do it in any way you please. But, I pray you, let this convention, these representatives of a large political party, not belittle itself or themselves to the extent of entering into a controversy, which, no matter how you word it, will remain undignified, will remain foolish. Comrades, we have plenty of work before us. We don't have to go out for work. Here we are, on the fourth day, and we have not as yet approached any one of the objects for which we have come here, and still the first thing is a letter drafted by a very gifted comrade, but yet something entirely out of our province, which takes one of your seven days' work, and you are ready still to discuss it. Get down to business, I ask you. (Applause.)

DEL. KAPLAN (Minn.): Mr. Chairman and comrades, I want to say, first of all, as a member of the Resolutions Committee, that had Comrade Spargo been directly in favor of the proposition which was presented here, which we as members of the Resolutions Committee all unanimously were against, the speech that he made as a preface before introducing our position was enough to cause you to be swayed just the other way. I am against sending that resolution to President Roosevelt. Sentiment, we must remember, should not be the kind of logic that should sway Socialist audiences. I admit that there was a good deal of oratory upon this floor, and I admit, and you must also admit, that oratory oftentimes carries a man off from the field of reason, away from the field of logic. On the impulse

of the moment and for the moment we lose sight of the substance and the logic of the proposition presented. Remember this, comrades; ours is not fundamentally a party of protest. Remember, that we stand as a revolutionary party. We are not alone to convert or to bother, mind you, for the purpose of converting or attacking a man who does not represent or does not claim to represent the working class. (Applause.) No, comrades, I do not believe in this sort of stuff. When Comrade Fieldman was upon the floor he told us about President Roosevelt as a representative of the people. But we as Socialists point out that President Roosevelt only represents that part of the people whom the dominant class in society represent and whom he is the arch representative of. I contend, as we all understand and claim fundamentally, that men are moved and act according to their material environment. Men who are elected to political office necessarily represent their class, and are true to the interests of that class. There are a great many men—don't forget, it has been stated upon this floor—workingmen, men whom we are out to convert, men who look upon President Roosevelt as a god. We admit, as we have always admitted, that the policy of some of you, some of our Socialist friends, in attacking certain men in the labor movement who do not agree with our principles, has kept the Socialist movement back. Why? Because the men who believed in those individuals were blinded on the impulse of the moment, blinded to the fundamental fact. It is only because we have reasoned our way out of it, only because we have actually realized that the best way to undermine the influence of the men on top, the best way to undermine the hero whom certain individuals that we are out to convert, whom the working class in society are worshipping, is to ignore those fellows by talking straight logic, talking straight Socialism, to the men whom we have got to convert. Now, I say, my friends and comrades, that sentiment is all right, but ours is a struggle. We have a hard fight. Eliminate all personalities. We are all standing for the same principle. If Comrade Hoehn wants that proposition to be sent out to the world, I have got no objection to the body substance of it. I do not agree with Comrade

Lewis in the position of criticising it. You could edit, if you agree with the basis of the proposition and believe in sending that to the president of the United States. My contention is that we must not allow ourselves to be carried away by sentiment. (Calls of "Time.") Allow me to conclude. The point is, shall we consider the individuals as more important than the class struggle? I do not think it is absolutely necessary to attack an individual in order to bring forth the fact that any proposition is true.

DEL. TOOLE (Md.): There has been a great deal said on both sides. Much of what has been said on both sides has been right, and much of what has been said on both sides has been wrong. Now, what we want to do is to pick out the right from both sides. Now, let us see if we cannot do it, and I have got a proposition that I think will do it if you will listen to me. In the first place, shall we send a personal letter to the president of the United States?

DELEGATES: No.

DEL. TOOLE: Of course, we oughtn't. We have got nothing to do with that. In the second place, ought we not to take advantage of the opportunity the president has given us to teach class consciousness? Yes. Well, how can we do it? That is the proposition. How can we avoid being ridiculous, and at the same time take advantage of this opportunity to teach class consciousness to the working class of this country? If we can find a way to do this, then we have done the right thing. Now, I propose that this convention do this—(losing his footing and slipping)—no, not that. I propose this: that this whole matter be referred to the Committee on Platform, with instructions that they place in that platform—(laughter)—wait a minute. Now, wait a minute, comrades; I am not half as foolish as half of you have been. (Laughter.) We want and should welcome the opportunity to teach class consciousness. Where is the place, where is the proper place for us to declare that we stand for class consciousness? Why, in the platform of the party, in the platform of the party; and if the platform of the Socialist party is drawn properly, it can take advantage of this matter. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I move that this whole matter be referred

to the Platform Committee, with instructions to place a plank in the platform as to our position on class consciousness.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is out of order, as there is a substitute before the house, and I recognized this delegate.

DEL. CARR (Ill.): Then I wish to move the previous question. (Seconded; carried.)

DEL. HANFORD (N. Y.): I wish to speak in favor of the substitute—to refer the letter to a committee for editing and revising, and that it then be adopted. I will be very brief if you will not interrupt me, and will try to save one or two minutes out of my five. First of all, to my mind this convention should very clearly and explicitly resent the imputation of the chairman of the Committee on Resolutions. When he brought in this report on Comrade Hoehn's document he characterized it as unfit to be read before this body. (Applause.) The natural inference from that was, either that the document was foolish or else that it was couched in such terms as are not in use among people of good repute. However, we finally did get the document read. After it had been read we found that, whatever else it may be, it is just as fitting that this body here should hear it as anything that has ever been printed in Socialist literature. (Applause.) I am not one of those who proposed to make or add to any division that may exist between the so-called intellectuals and the proletariat. I regret that there is any ground of friction between them. To my mind, the proletarian cannot be too intellectual, and the intellectual cannot be too thoroughly imbued with the proletarian spirit. It is one of my misfortunes, and I confess it not only with regret but with a certain measure of shame, that I am not and never hope to be a good master of the English language; but I want to say to Comrade Lewis, and to all those others who labor under the apprehension that this document is not in classic English—I want to say to them that it is in understandable English. (Applause.) It is in terms that workingmen will understand. (Applause.) The class struggle is not a treatise on grammar. While the document is addressed to the Honorable Theodore Roosevelt, the only reason we take this notice of him

is, not to educate him, but to educate the man that works. (Applause.) Mr. Chairman, and the chairman of the Resolutions Committee, we need not fear that this convention will appear undignified when it resents the attack that has been made upon Socialism by the President of the United States. (Applause.) I am not afraid, after fifteen years of agitation in the Socialist party, of being called ridiculous when a man applies an undeserved epithet to me.

Comrade Kaplan is much worried lest some one be influenced by the heat of oratory. I want to tell Comrade Kaplan that oratory has its power in this one thing: it is oftentimes the fact that the true orator is right and that the man that is not capable of oratory is wrong. (Applause.)

I wish to say further to Comrade Hillquit, that I am not at all alarmed as to whether this proposition be considered by the President of the United States. We simply address that man at the top of capitalist society in order to reach the multitude of men at its very bottom. (Applause.) I know perfectly well that the idea of ever educating Theodore Roosevelt is a hopeless task. (Applause.)

I remember away back in the year 1886, when Theodore Roosevelt, the man who now poses as a reformer—I remember that away back in 1886 he was so much a reformer that he opposed Henry George for Mayor of New York. I remember that ever since that time this same honorable gentleman that now is trying to make the workingmen of this country think he is their friend—I remember that ever since that time he has been lined up with every scalawag and has been friends with every old gray wolf in Republican politics that this country has seen. (Applause.) He has been the distinguished friend of the Honorable Thomas C. Platt, the distinguished friend of the Honorable Chauncey M. Depew; "honorable," I say; there is classic English for Mr. Lewis. (Applause.) We know that this same man who today comes to the workingmen of the United States and tells them he wants Congress to pass an anti-injunction bill, this man, what did he do not long ago? He tried to get the Honorable William H. Taft, Secretary of War—he tried to get that man, the old original, almost the inventor of the in-

junction against labor organizations in the United States—he tried to put him on the bench of the Supreme Court of the United States, and Taft would not take the appointment. And why? Why, because Taft and his masters, the capitalist class of the United States, thought that they could have Congress pass an anti-injunction bill if they had a pro-injunction President and a pro-injunction Supreme Court of the United States. So I say, let us expose their plans in every way that is possible, and send out a document that will be read by the working class, and every workingman in the United States will make agitation for our cause and against that of the capitalist class. (Applause.)

DEL. YOUNG (Pa.): I speak on the negative. Mr. Chairman, when I heard the remarks of Comrade Spargo I was the one who moved to lay this motion on the table. I am very glad now that it was not done. From the reading of this letter I heard nothing in the letter which was ridiculous or which was improper to be brought before this convention. But we are here offered a great opportunity, an opportunity that has never been offered to the Socialist party before, and we must not because of this opportunity let any hysterical measures pass before us. We have a great responsibility to our constituents. I deny the right of this convention to send any letter to Theodore Roosevelt as an executive document without a referendum to the party. (Applause.) We have our Platform Committee; we have our Resolutions Committee. Let us answer this imputation in our platform, but not in a personal letter to Theodore Roosevelt. My friends, it is an old trick of the lawyers, and—well, I don't say what I think about lawyers—but it is an old trick of theirs to get a rise out of the opposing lawyer. Now, Theodore Roosevelt does not send a message to Congress and has not sent one in a good many years when the Socialist party of this country has not gotten a rise out of it. Now, don't let Theodore Roosevelt get a rise out of the Socialists. Don't let him badger us into doing a foolish thing. Don't let this convention send him any letter. What we want to say, let us say in our platform.

DEL. POPE (Mo.): I am utterly astonished at some of the statements

that have been made in this convention. I heard that letter read before ever it came to this convention. I did not listen for language, but I did listen for ideas, and this is the first impression that came to my mind, and when the impression came to my mind I said, "Yes, Comrade Hoehn, introduce it;" and that impression was this, that in that letter was an answer to Theodore Roosevelt's challenge to the Socialist party. Now, I want to say that every man that has ever stood on a platform, that has ever said a word in behalf of Socialism, has been grossly insulted by that letter. I do not fight Theodore Roosevelt as an individual; no. But whom does he represent? Whom does Theodore Roosevelt represent? He represents the enemies of whom? Of the working class. And he did it deliberately. He did not say to the Democrat, "You are so and so." He did not say to the prohibitionist, "You are so and so." He did not say to the populist, "You are so and so." No, but with the same maliciousness, with the same underhanded method that he has always used, he employed the great position that he has been placed in, to do what? To keep the people who have not got the Socialist message yet, in ignorance, because he knows that whenever the American workingmen understand Socialism, he and his class will walk out of the government, never to return. (Applause.) Now, then, I want to say that I am in favor of that committee. Why? You let this great Socialist convention adjourn and go home, and each one of you has clinging to you, applied by the President of the United States, the word "foul." That is attached to you. Every one of you that will leave this convention, you will go out with the word "foul" attached to you. Now, where is the class struggle? Why not answer him? We have got to answer him. It is up to us. We have got to face him, and we are going to face him. The day of martyrs in the Socialist party is past. We are standing on firm ground, and we are going to answer him. (Applause.) Now, then, what will we gain by it? Comrade Hanford has told you. I hope, comrades, you will elect this committee and we will send a letter which says to the capitalist class, "No longer can you denounce us without our coming back, because we are a militant organiza-

tion and we are going to win." (Applause.)

DEL. SPARGO: Comrade Chairman and comrades, I want the attention of your brains, and I care nothing for your passions at this time. I will yield to no man or woman on the floor of this convention in my adherence to what I conceive to be the sole principle of modern Socialism, the class struggle. And I ask you to remember, comrades, that the mouthers of revolutionary phrases described by Karl Marx were the men who tried to hound Marx himself out of the international movement, on the same ground of prejudice which has characterized most of this debate.

I myself have not raised the question of grammatical construction nor literary form with regard to this letter. If the letter were a rational letter, if it were a Socialist letter, if it were a letter in line with class struggle theory of modern Socialism, then I would say, comrades, let us send it. But I know that the letter is not in line with the class struggle, and there is not a Socialist on this convention floor, who understands that principle, who for a moment will be prepared to accept that letter.

First of all, is it a fact that when we go out to fight our capitalist foes, that because they use hard words about us we must drop the class struggle and protest that we are insulted? In the name of God, comrades, what are we about? We might as well talk of the class struggle and engrave it on a Tiffany pink tea invitation. (Applause.) If we do this it will be because in a moment of weakness we surrender to a sort of wave of demagoguery coming from another of my New York comrades and associates. Comrades, let me ask you, do you believe this statement which I will read? I care not if written in the language of the classics; I care not if every word were of the purest gold; I am not so sensitive as my friend Lewis is upon that matter; I am looking for Socialism. Here is the statement: "You, Mr. President, have repeatedly demanded from Congress laws for the benefit of the people, but your demands were ignored because of capitalist class interests."

A DELEGATE: Not a word of it.

DEL. SPARGO: I ask you, comrades, are you going to vote, are you going to say for a single moment that

Theodore Roosevelt is on the side of the working class?

DELEGATES: No.

DEL. SPARGO: I say no. I will read further from the same letter: "If in place of the political undertakers there were seated in the halls of Congress fifty or one hundred class conscious working men and Socialists, every demand for labor legislation made by you or by organized labor would be voted." I ask you, comrades, are you going to play into the hands of Theodore Roosevelt and give him the best kind of a campaign weapon?

DELEGATES: No.

DEL. SPARGO: It is therefore not a question of grammar: It is a question of Socialist philosophy and of Socialist common sense; and I ask you to vote down the motion to refer; to vote down the motion to send it to Roosevelt, and send it where it belongs, under the table or anywhere else. (Applause.)

DEL. LEWIS (Ill.): A question of personal privilege.

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrade Lewis, on a question of personal privilege.

DEL. LEWIS: I have purposely refrained on this point from disturbing any previous speaker, but I wish to protest against the assumption that has run all through this controversy, that the point I raised was a question either of classic English or of grammar. It was a question of Socialist philosophy alone. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor of the amendment referring to a committee will signify it by saying aye. Contrary, no.

A division was called for.

THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favor of the motion will raise their hands. Contrary.

DEL. KEARNS (N. J.): I desire to have my vote as a member of the Resolutions Committee recorded as voting against reference to committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right.

ASST. SEC. STRICKLAND: The vote stands, affirmative 80, negative 101. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It now recurs on the motion that it be printed by the national office and a copy, together with the manifesto, be sent to the president. All in favor will say aye. Contrary, no.

The noes seem to have it; they have it.

THE LIQUOR QUESTION.

DEL. SPARGO: Comrade Chairman and comrades, in continuing the report of the Resolutions Committee, will you permit me to say that no word I said concerning that resolution this morning or at any time was intended as any kind of a personal reflection upon my friend and comrade Hoehn from St. Louis. (Applause). There is not a man upon the floor of this convention for whom I entertain greater respect. But, comrades, I may have said something which did seem to be hard and bitter. If so, while that is still my opinion of the document, I desire to give this assurance, that I have no malice or no evil thought or opinion in my mind regarding either Comrade Hoehn or any other comrade who has participated in this discussion. (Applause.)

The last resolution that is part of our report is on the question of alcoholism. The delegates of the convention may know that there is a very considerable sentiment in favor of the convention taking some attitude upon the question of prohibition of the liquor traffic. There has been submitted to the committee and your committee beg to report a resolution which while not in line with the demand for prohibition of the liquor traffic, nor as stringent as the last resolution of the German party, is nevertheless important in that it is the first time that a Socialist party convention has been asked to pass upon the question of alcoholism at all. I hope, therefore, that every delegate, and for that matter the visitors, will listen as carefully as possible. I will read as carefully as possible, so that there may be no misunderstanding:

"We fully recognize the serious evils incident to the manufacture and sale for private profit of alcoholic and adulterated liquors. We hold that any excessive use of liquor by members of the working class is a serious obstacle to the triumph of our class since it impairs the vigor of the fighters in the political and economic struggle, and we urge the members of the working class to avoid any indulgence that might hinder the progress of the movement for their emancipation.

"On the other hand, we do not believe that the evils of alcoholism can be remedied by any extension of the

police powers of the capitalist state. Alcoholism is a disease of which capitalism is the chief cause, and the remedy lies rather in doing away with the underfeeding, overwork and overworry which result from the wage system."

The reading of the resolution was received with applause.

DEL. SPARGO: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Resolutions Committee I move the adoption of the resolution I have read.

Motion seconded by various members.

THE CHAIRMAN: A motion has been made and seconded to adopt the resolution as reported. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. HILLQUIT: Just a question to the chairman of the Resolutions Committee. Would the committee accept the expression "cured" instead of the expression "remedied" in one place? The expression as it stands now, is, I believe, that the evil cannot be remedied by any extension of the police powers. Now, I am afraid that is overstating the proposition. It may be remedied somewhat, but it certainly cannot be cured.

DEL. SPARGO: The chairman of the Resolutions Committee would say that in our discussions we developed the point that we were willing, I think, to accept such changes as that. Unless one of my colleagues objects I have no hesitation in saying that we would accept it. The request is to change the word "remedied" to "cure." I would also say that the chairman of your Resolutions Committee is himself quite unable to distinguish between a cure and a remedy. (Laughter.)

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection it is now cured. (Laughter.)

DEL. HILLQUIT: It may be in order, if I may be pardoned, to offer advice to the Resolutions Committee—

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it has been accepted.

DEL. HILLQUIT: I would say that there is a great difference between the two.

THE CHAIRMAN: You may send a dictionary to the committee.

Question called for.

The motion was carried and the resolution adopted as changed.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FARMERS' PROGRAM.

THE CHAIRMAN: The report of the Committee on Farmers' Program.

DEL. THOMPSON (Wis.), reporting for the committee: Comrades, we have had only one meeting and are not able to make a complete report, but there is one point upon which we were absolutely agreed, all of us, and I believe that all the rest of you will agree, and that was in this, and so we report this to be our recommendation at this time, hoping to have this accepted, rather than holding another session later to report further upon this question. The committee agreed unanimously in recommending this item:

"Your committee recommends that this convention elect a committee of seven to study the agricultural question in its relation to Socialism and report recommendations to the membership of the party through the Socialist press at least one year before the next national convention."

The report was adopted and election of permanent committee deferred.

RESPONSE TO SARAH A. BIGELOW.

ASST. SEC. STRICKLAND: The secretary was instructed to draft a letter in response to the mother of Comrade Bigelow. I will read it:

To Mrs. Sarah A. Bigelow, 1149 Jackson Boul., Chicago.

Beloved and venerable comrade: Your message was read to the convention and received with reverent attention and applause. To you, dear comrade, mother of one of our bravest propagandists, who gave his great life to a greater cause, it has been the destiny of life to give to the Socialist movement a noble, faithful and beloved comrade. Amid the tears with which you water his grave and hallow his memory may the love of his and your comrades gladden and sanctify your sunset years.

Signed for the Convention,
National Socialist Convention.

Chicago, May 13, 1908.

DEL. O'HARE (Okla.): I move its adoption by a rising vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: Moved and seconded that the communication be ap-

proved and that the same be sent; all in favor will please rise.

The motion was adopted unanimously by a rising vote.

LENGTH OF SPEECHES.

DEL. WHEAT (Cal.): I listened to the debate this morning; and I noticed that comrade after comrade repeated the same thought over and over again. The comrades as a rule said just as much in five minutes as they said in ten. It seemed to me that as we must get through with the business of this convention, and as every five minutes costs us money, we ought to do something in that direction, and I desire to move that we reconsider the rule and that five minutes instead of ten shall be set as the limit for speakers in debates.

The motion to reconsider was seconded and carried.

A motion to limit speeches to five minutes was carried.

DELEGATES' MILEAGE.

NAT. SEC. BARNES: I have a supplementary statement to offer which was promised this morning. A number of questions were asked relating to payments since the report given this morning was closed. That report was closed on the 8th of May. This brings the report up to the close of business last evening, in regard to this question of the payment of assessment stamps. I wish to add further that I know there are several state secretaries in the hall who have money, and who say they have not had an opportunity to visit the office and turn it in.

California	\$ 77.00
Idaho50
Indiana	6.65

Iowa	26.95
Maine	13.65
Massachusetts	211.65
Montana	10.00
New Mexico	7.25
Oregon	46.10
South Dakota	6.30
Texas35
Utah	24.20
West Virginia	4.90
Wyoming	1.75

Total\$437.26

Making a grand total for assessments until close of business last night \$7,580.30, and by collections \$389.75 or a total of \$7,970.05.

This represents as near as we can estimate, and I believe we have estimated largely, about one hundred dollars in excess of our total liabilities for mileage to delegates.

On motion the supplemental report of the secretary was adopted.

DEL. KEARNS (N. J.): I would like to ask the secretary if he can give the names of those who have money ready to turn over and the amounts.

NAT. SEC. BARNES: I stated that several secretaries so informed me. I don't remember who they are exactly.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection the supplementary report will go to the auditing committee.

DEL. SOLOMON (N. Y.): I desire to state with regard to the amount credited to New York that before I left for Chicago from New York I sent to Comrade Barnes three hundred dollars. That was on account, of the amount coming from the state of New York. I have in the meantime collected three hundred dollars more; and I have no doubt that by the time I return to New York there will be two hundred dollars more.

Adjourned.

FIFTH DAY'S SESSION

The convention was called to order at 10 o'clock A. M.

Asst. Sec. Strickland read a number of communications, as follows:

COMMUNICATIONS.

"May 13.

"To the National Convention, Socialist Party, Brand's Hall, Chicago.

"The Socialist party of Washington gratefully acknowledges in this manner revolutionary stand by national convention. This will enable us to make better fight than ever against capitalism without, by disposing of enemies within. No compromise forever.

(Signed) "Arthur Jensen,
"Acting Secretary."

(Translation of Lettish telegram.)

"Boston, May 19, 1908.

"Convention Socialist Party, Chicago, Ill., U. S. A., Brand's Hall.

"The Central Committee, United Lettish Social Democracy of America sends its heartiest greetings to convention of Socialist party of America, and asks also to put the immigration question on the order of business and to consider that from all sides, as it is of the utmost importance to us. In the name of the United Lettish Social Democrats of America, and by order of the Central Committee. "John Klauber,
"Secretary."

"Port Perry, Pa., May 13.

"Chairman, National Convention, Chicago.

"Comrades, success to your national convention. May its deliberations be marked by kindness among all comrades and antagonism to our opponents. May the results of our convention strike dismay into the hearts of all supporters of this hell upon earth and fire the hearts of all comrades throughout the length and breadth of the land with a determin-

ation to so order themselves from now on that our vote next November shall strike terror into the hearts of the capitalists, inspire hope in the hearts of the working class, and bring complete victory four years hence. Yours for the abolition of hell. "W. Blenco."

"P. S.—I would have sent this by wire, but did not like to support the philanthropic telegraph companies any more than is absolutely necessary."

Del. Clark, of Texas, was elected chairman for the day.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: I may not be a very good parliamentarian, and you may say when I get through that I have not been a close reader of parliamentary law, but if you stick to your constitution better than you have been sticking you won't call on me to stick to parliamentary law today. So let us not demand too much, but let us start out in a systematic way and we will expedite matters in a far more thorough manner than we have been doing before.

A newly arrived delegate, Ryckman, of Wyoming, was seated without referring his credential to the Credentials Committee.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON LABOR ORGANIZATIONS.

DEL. LEE (N. Y.), reporting for the Committee on Labor Organizations: Mr. Chairman and Delegates, your Committee on Labor Organizations is glad to be able to make a unanimous report. (Applause.) I think it will not be necessary in introducing this report to make any extended remarks. I suppose it is very likely the report will be debated upon the floor, and I should perhaps be only wasting time if I should give any statement on behalf of the committee in introducing this report, further than to say this: that it has been the judgment of your committee—and

they have believed that they represented the judgment of the convention as a whole in this—it has been the judgment of your committee that the declaration that this convention should adopt upon the subject of labor organizations this year should not be, as have been our declarations in the past, simply a declaration of the attitude, the formal attitude of the party legally; so to speak, toward trade unionism, but that it should be in the nature of an address, a statement, a somewhat emphatic statement, of the position of the Socialist party with regard to the trade unions as they find themselves face to face with the organizations of the capitalist class on line of battle; and it is with this idea in view that your committee has drawn the declaration which I now read to you, and which, after it is read, I shall move to be adopted:

ADDRESS TO ORGANIZED LABOR.

The following is the address to organized labor drafted by the committee and submitted to the Socialist National convention:

"The movement of organized labor is a natural result of the antagonism between the interests of employers and wage-earners under the capitalist system. Its activity in the daily struggle over wages, hours, and other conditions of labor is absolutely necessary to counteract the evil effects of competition among the working people and to save them from being reduced to material and moral degradation. It is equally valuable as a force for the social, economic and political education of the workers.

It Does Not Dictate.

"The Socialist party does not seek to dictate to organized labor in matters of internal organization and union policy. It recognizes the necessary autonomy of the union movement on the economic field, as it insists on maintaining its own autonomy on the political field. It is confident that in the school of experience organized labor will as rapidly as possible develop the most effective forms of organization and methods of action.

"In the history of the recent Moyer-Haywood protest, participated in by unions of all sorts and by the Socialist party, it finds reason to hope for closer solidarity on the economic field and for

more effective co-operation between organized labor and the Socialist party, the two wings of the movement for working-class emancipation.

"The Socialist party stands with organized labor in all its struggles to resist capitalist aggression or to wrest from the capitalists any improvement in the conditions of labor. It declares that it is the duty of every wage-worker to be an active and loyal member of the organized labor movement, striving to win its battles and to strengthen and perfect it for the greater struggles to come.

Confronted by Great Crisis.

"Organized labor is today confronted by a great crisis. The capitalists, intoxicated with wealth and power and alarmed by the increasing political and economic activity of the working class, have as a class undertaken a crusade for the destruction of the labor organizations.

"In Colorado, Nevada, Alaska and elsewhere law and constitution have been trampled under foot, military despotism set up, and judicial murder attempted with this aim in view. Where such violent methods have not seemed advisable, other means have been used to the same end.

"The movement for the so-called open shop but thinly veils an attempt to close the shops against organized workingmen; it is backed by powerful capitalist organizations, with millions of dollars in their war funds.

Courts Always Hostile.

"The courts, always hostile to labor, have of late outdone all previous records in perverting the law to the service of the capitalist class. They have issued injunctions forbidding the calling of strikes, the announcement of boycotts, payment of union benefits, or even any attempt to organize unorganized workingmen in certain trades and places. They have issued arbitrary decrees dissolving unions under the pretense of their being labor trusts.

"They have sustained the capitalists in bringing damage suits against unions for the purpose of tying up or sequestering their funds. They have wiped off the statute books many labor laws—laws protecting little children from exploitation in the factory, laws making employers liable for damage in case

of employees killed or injured at their work, laws guaranteeing the right of workingmen to belong to unions.

"While affirming the right of employers to bar organized workingmen from employment, they have declared it unlawful for workingmen to agree not to patronize non-union establishments. The only consistent rule observed by the courts in dealing with the labor question is the rule that capitalists have a sacred right to profits and that the working class has no rights in opposition to business interests.

Danbury Hatters' Case.

"In the Danbury hatters' case the United States Supreme court has rendered a decision worthy to stand with its infamous 'Dred Scott decision' of fifty years ago. It has stretched and distorted the Anti-Trust law to make it cover labor organizations, and has held that the peaceful method of the boycott is unlawful, that boycotted employers may recover damages to the amount of three times their loss, and that the property of individual members, as well as the union treasuries, may be levied upon to collect such damages.

"By this decision the Supreme court has clearly shown itself to be an organ of class injustice not of social justice. If this and other hostile decisions are not speedily reversed, organized labor will find itself completely paralyzed in its efforts toward a peaceful solution of the labor question. The success of the capitalists and their courts in this assault upon the labor movement would be a disaster to civilization and humanity. It can and must be defeated.

Ballot is a Weapon.

"At this critical moment the Socialist party calls upon all organized workingmen to remember that they still have the ballot in their hands and to realize that the intelligent use of political power is absolutely necessary to save their organizations from destruction. The unjust decision of the Supreme court can be reversed, the arbitrary use of the military can be stopped, the wiping out of labor laws can be prevented by the united action of the workingmen on election day.

"Workingmen of the United States, use your political arm in harmony with

your economic arm for defense and attack. Rally to the support of the party of your class. Vote as you strike, against the capitalists. Down with military and judicial usurpation! Forward, in one solid phalanx, under the banners of Organized Labor and of the Socialist party, to defeat capitalist aggressions, to win immediate relief for yourselves and your wives and children, and to hasten the day of complete emancipation from capitalist exploitation and misrule."

DEL. LEE: I move the adoption of this declaration. (Seconded.)

DEL. KAPLAN (Minn.): Mr. Chairman, I rise, not to object to any part of the resolution that is presented here by our Labor Committee, but I do contend that there is something lacking that necessarily should be inserted, and it is this: We have arrived at a time when capitalism is organizing all along the line. The principle of trustification is evident, whichever way we may turn. I see in this resolution, however, no statement in any manner, shape or form recommending to organized labor the necessity of studying up the question of the industrial form of unionism. (Applause.) Now wait a moment. I am not saying that that necessarily anticipates the starting of an opposition economic organization in any part of the country against those that are already in existence. I believe that the tactics of the old Socialist Labor party in undertaking to formulate and inaugurate the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance was decidedly detrimental and decidedly injurious; but I do contend, on the other hand, had they used the same principle, had they told our membership and had they said to the workers, those who had become class conscious, "Work within the American Federation of Labor, work within your other pure and simple organizations and ask them to realize and point out the necessity of working along class lines rather than craft lines;" (applause)—"if that had been done, I believe we would have had today a greater Socialist movement. I believe the American Federation of Labor would have been a good deal more advanced than it is today.

In the city of Duluth at the present time there is not a strike, but a lockout. Why? Because the men connected with the different building trades have said that "We will back up one union, the one

out on strike; we will back up its fight and we will fight and stand on that proposition united." And because that happened, they recognized what? That united action along class lines, united action, working together, all the different labor organizations, meant something that once the labor organizations introduced as a principle within the American Federation of Labor would enable them to do something, to accomplish some results today. So they got together and forced a lock-out. They said to those men, "We are not against you men working within your individual labor organizations. We are not against your fighting us as individual organizations, but just as soon as you undertake to work together, that is another proposition." I want to say this, that there is only one union there, the Bricklayers, that did not participate in the conference, and what was the result? We have the Bricklayers' union in the City of Duluth with union men working side by side with scabs; that is the result. Mind you, I am not blaming the Bricklayers' Union, but that is the result of the principle of craft unionism. And I am not attacking, as I say, the American Federation of Labor. I am not saying that we must endorse or say that you must start an opposition economic organization, but I do say that you must make and embody in that resolution a recommendation suggesting to members of organized labor to recognize that principle and try to work for that principle and formulate it within their particular labor organizations. I thank you. (Applause.)

DEL. FARRELL (Ohio): Comrade Chairman and comrades, I am of the opinion that to adopt the report of the Committee on Organized Labor would not be a mistake on the part of this convention. The comrade from Duluth has pointed out what the building trades of that city are doing in regard to developing the industrial side of organized labor. As a member of a craft organization I want to say that I heartily endorse the industrial form of organization. (Applause.) But let me tell you that there is a force at work that is causing the American Federation of Labor organization and affiliated crafts to adopt industrial forms of organized labor, just the same force that caused the Socialist movement to be given birth.

I want to say as a member of one of the building trades organizations, that that part of the organized labor movement of this country is getting together today as one solid organization. A few years ago they organized what is known as the Structural Building Trade Alliance, aside from the American Federation of Labor, an organization composed of all the various building trade crafts. Eventually they got in touch with the American Federation of Labor, and it is now known as the building trade section of the American Federation of Labor. It is practically an industrial form of organization in so far as the building trades of this country are concerned; it is nothing more or less than an industrial form of organization.

I want to say that this report of the committee, in pointing out that organized labor should control its movement on the economic field, just as the Socialist Party demands the right and declares the right to control its work on the economic field. (Applause.) I want to say that a few weeks ago, when the Citizens' Alliance and the Employers' Association, in the city of Dayton, with Mr. Van Cleave and one or two others there as invited guests, had their banquet at the Dayton Club, that Mr. Van Cleave in his address to the association pointed out the fact that if it should come to the point through the development of the class struggle that the working class and their friends should line up on one side, he and his class would be found lined up on the other side, regardless of politics, creed or color. (Applause.) And I want to say that those things are awakening the craft organizations which go to make up the American Federation of Labor organized movement.

I would say to this convention, adopt that report as we have got it here. There is one thing we have learned in the last four years that I wish to compliment our Socialist movement on, and this convention particularly, that we have today found out how to draft up a resolution of this kind without any particular friction on the part of our convention.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.

DEL. FARRELL: I hope this thing will go through without a dissenting vote, and I thank you.

DEL. KEARNS (N. J.): I feel that we have made a magnificent step for-

ward from the position we occupied yesterday, in that we are extending the courtesy of silence to each of the speakers and allowing them to have their say without interruption. I will thank you for the same courtesy that you have extended to the others. I am in a measure muzzled by my state, and I am further crippled by the fact that I am an Irishman (laughter), and an Irishman, you know, is allowed, as a rule, to talk until he is understood. (Laughter.) Before I take the position that I am directed to take, I want to say that aspersions have been cast upon the state of New Jersey almost to the measure of charging us with cowardice. I feel that we can well afford to let that go by, because the history of the state of New Jersey is not only clear, but clean and straight, and there is not a coward among us.

I am directed by my state to oppose any action tending toward the recognition of the S. L. P., any move toward unity with that organization, because we have passed through that period and know it is utterly impossible to mix with that bunch. I am also directed to oppose any recognition of craft unionism as against industrialism, but I am confident that the state of New Jersey stands as a unit for organized labor as a whole. (Applause.) While I have not been instructed I do want to say that a serious mistake or omission has been made by this committee, and that is that you have not once mentioned the women; and I move that this address be so changed that wherever "workingmen" is mentioned the addition of "and women" be made (applause), because they are a part of our organization, and I so move, Comrade Chairman. (Seconded.)

DEL. OSBORNE (Cal.): I would like to ask if that means that wherever there is a man the man is to embrace the woman. (Laughter.)

DEL. MARGUERITE PREVEY (Ohio): Comrades and friends, it seems to me that it is unnecessary to bring up the question of women in the resolution that has just been put in by the Resolutions Committee. You know there is a committee working on the question of the relation of women to the Socialist movement, or the relation of the Socialist movement to women, and we were before the Platform Committee last evening, and asked the Platform Committee that when they mentioned

workingmen they would also mention workingwomen, and the Platform Committee is going to take care of that proposition, so it seems to me that when organized labor is mentioned the women are included in that way. The women in the Socialist movement do not want any special recognition. All we ask for is the same recognition as men. The women in the Socialist movement are able to speak for themselves, and when the question of the relation of women to Socialism comes up we will be heard. Now, I want to say one word in reference to the resolution that has been brought in by this committee, and I want to say that I heartily endorse those resolutions. We of the Socialist Party believe we are scientific Socialists. We believe that the Socialist movement came into existence as an economic necessity of the working class, and that the organized labor movement came into existence, like every other institution in the world, as an economic necessity of the working class. The members of craft unionism in the American Federation of Labor are learning by the capitalist class opposing them, and by court decisions recently rendered, that the battle has been transferred from the industrial to the political field, and that they must get into the political arena if they expect to be saved or to get any of the wealth they produce. We cannot cram industrialism down the throat of the workingman. He learned to organize before the Socialist Party came into existence, and he is going into the industrial form of organization when he finds that he can get more of the products of his labor through that form. (Applause.) The working class do not need any dictation from the Socialist Party. They won't accept any dictation from the Socialist Party, and they are right. (Applause.) They do not need dictators. They are learning their own economic interests, and they are getting into the industrial form of organization just as rapidly as they are able to absorb the proposition. (Applause.) It does seem to me that every delegate in this convention who is a clear thinker should accept those resolutions, and they should be endorsed unanimously, so that we may go before the industrialists and before the craft unionists and say that the workers must go into the political arena if they expect to be saved. They must fight through the union of the craft or

the particular form of organization they have on the economic field, and they must fight on the political field, and the Socialist Party is their party on the political field. (Applause.)

DEL. WALDHORST (Ala.): I do not see anything whatever in these resolutions that will not suit a man that is an industrialist as well as a man that is a craft autonomist in his shop, and I think we have so much work at hand before us today, if we don't want to stay here another week, that the less we can say on these subjects and the shorter, the better it will be. A good many are getting tired now, and it seems to me, from the applause that you gave the speakers before me, you see how the sentiment stands in regard to these resolutions. One comrade who has spoken, I think has given the line of argument as impartially as I or anybody else could make it, and for that reason I move the previous question. (Secunded.)

DELEGATES: Oh, no.

THE CHAIRMAN: The previous question has been moved. All in favor say aye. Contrary, no. The noes have it.

DEL. KORNGOLD (Ill.): I do not believe there are half of the people here who do not believe in industrial unionism. We might not believe in the tactics of the I. W. W. I for one believe that there are more industrialists in the American Federation of Labor than there are in the I. W. W., but I cannot see why we Socialists should not recognize that industrial unionism is a better form of organization than craft unionism. The American Federation of Labor, I believe, in the convention, not one of them oppose a resolution endorsing industrial unionism, so certainly the Socialist Party need not be afraid of endorsing industrial unionism. Besides, we are not dictating to the labor unions what they shall do; we are simply recommending. We Socialists have attacked Samuel Gompers and other leaders of the labor unions because they have not recommended to their followers to take political action. Why, then, should we as a political party not recommend to the labor unions to take industrial action? (Applause.) If we do not do so we are just as guilty as Samuel Gompers. (Applause.) There is no labor union which today does not believe in it. I do know the labor organizations are drifting toward industrial

unionism. The American Federation of Labor, as I have said, has recognized this fact, has recognized and adopted a resolution that industrial unionism is the best form of unionism, and we Socialists, without endorsing either the I. W. W. or the A. F. of L., ought to stand for industrialism, at least in a recommendation.

DEL. McDEVITT (Cal.): I move as an amendment the insertion at the end of the third paragraph of this language. It is short, it is clear, it is comprehensive, it is the least we can do, and we should do at least this much: "But we realize that it is the duty of the Socialist Party to point out to the workers that the industrial form of organization is best suited to developing the working class solidarity necessary to the success of organized labor under the present methods of production." (Secunded.)

DEL. WHEAT (Cal.): In regard to the first amendment I desire to move the previous question, simply for that amendment. (Secunded.)

DEL. MERRILL (Cal.): Before the previous question is put I wish to call the attention of the convention to the last paragraph or division, beginning "ballot is a weapon," and if you insert "working women" you will find the inconsistency of it. It will read like this, if your amendment is carried: "At this critical moment the Socialist Party calls upon all working men and working women to remember that they still have the ballot in their hands." (Laughter.) The motion for the previous question was then carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: We now come to the previous question on Comrade Kearns' amendment.

A DELEGATE: That amendment, I trust, will be changed so as to overcome the objection of the comrade.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will hear the amendment, so you will know what you are voting for. We are on the first amendment, which is—

ASST. SEC. REILLY: The amendment by Kearns of New Jersey is that where the words "working men" appear the words "and working women" be added.

The motion on the amendment was then put, and the amendment was lost.

DEL. PEISER (N. Y.): I move the previous question on the motion. (Secunded.)

Manifestations of objection from different delegates.

THE CHAIRMAN: You may have four speeches if you want to. All in favor of the previous question say aye. Contrary, no.

A division was called for, and on a vote by raised hands the motion was carried.

DEL. HOGAN (Ark.): Was this previous question here on the amendment or on the main question?

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair rules that it carries both. Now, notice, the ruling of the house is that there remain two speeches on each side of this case, so tell the chair which side you desire to speak on.

DEL. HOGAN: I am opposed to the resolution. Mr. Chairman and comrades, I had hoped the previous question would not be ordered at this time, for the reason that there are a number of comrades whom I should have greatly desired to hear speak on this question. But since it has been ordered, since perhaps I may not have an opportunity to get the floor again, I am going to call your attention to some things occurring in this resolution to which your attention ought to be very forcibly directed, and more forcibly perhaps than I in my humble, weak way will be able to do. I desire, first, to call your attention to an expression down here in one paragraph under the subhead, "Courts Always Hostile," and I read from that paragraph: "The courts, always hostile to labor, have of late outdone all previous records in perverting the law." Those three words, "in perverting the law," are an expression to which I heartily object. I maintain that the courts of this country have not perverted the law; that the courts of this country have interpreted the law rightfully; that they have interpreted the laws according as they were enacted and for the purpose they were enacted for; that the courts and the judges of the courts and the officers of the courts, so far as they are concerned, have interpreted the laws as they were enacted and intended to be interpreted, and have not perverted the law to any extent whatever. (Applause.) Here is another paragraph, under the same subhead, which says that the courts have "wiped off the statute books many labor laws, laws protecting little children from exploitation in the factory." That is a lie.

DEL. GERBER (N. Y.): It is not. DEL. HOGAN: It is.

DEL. HUNTER (N. Y.): I want to speak against the amendment, because I don't believe it to be the business of a political party, even though that party be a working class party, to dictate to other organizations, industrial organizations, in the industrial field, their form of organization. I consider it an impertinence for the Socialist Party to attempt to tell the American Federation of Labor or the Industrial Workers of the World, or any other industrial or craft organization, the kind of organization which they should adopt in their particular field of activity.

Some of you know, perhaps, that I have spent some time recently abroad, studying the European movement. I think they have got one thing clear in nearly every country in Europe, and that is that while these two organizations—the political and the industrial organization—are the two arms of the same man, yet those two arms must be kept completely and entirely autonomous. Although it is our proudest badge to represent the working class, we are here gathered, persons from all possible occupations and all possible positions. There are clergymen here, there are professors here, there are men of means, there are lawyers, all kinds of persons—it is manifestly unfair and unjust that an organization that is smaller in the political field than the industrial organizations are in the industrial field should dictate to them the kind of organization they should have.

It is also manifestly unwise for an organization which attempts to group within its circle the farmers and other unorganized workers and classes in the professions, and all classes of workers, brain workers and other workers, clerks and so on, to try to set a particular stamp upon an industrial organization.

Now, we ourselves are divided. There is a large number in this body who still believe in giving every possible support to the American Federation of Labor; many believe here that if the Industrial Workers or those who advocate the industrial form of organization and wish to have that form adopted by the labor movement, they should stay in the American Federation of Labor and try to get it adopted there. There are others who believe that they ought to go out

and try to force that form of organization upon all classes of workers organized and unorganized. They have a perfect right to such opinions. Those are questions of tactics. They have a perfect right to believe what they wish to. But have we as a party—we are divided among ourselves as the labor movement is divided among themselves—have we the right, in view of the great division existing here, to try to formulate a decision in regard to an organization that is not officially or definitely represented here?

Now, I hope very much that we will keep clearly to our political field. Let us give every possible support to every body of workingmen organized in this country; let us fight their battles as though they were our battles, whether they adopt one form of organization or another form of organization. But let us try not to be so impertinent or swell headed as to believe that we can stand here and dictate to another movement outside of our specific field the kind of organization which it shall have.

DEL. HAYES (Ohio): Regarding the amendment before the house, it seems to me that if the comrades who are in favor of it would stop to consider that as we are now entering a great presidential contest the adoption of that proposition would tend to place us not in the position that we ought to occupy—that is, fighting aggressively—but rather we should be thrown upon the defensive, and you can readily understand that it will be injurious to the movement.

I know something about the internal struggles of the trades union movement of the United States through the past dozen years by reason of having been fortunate enough to attend the conventions of the Federation of Labor for ten years past, and I know also that the men who believe in craft autonomy as a general rule are just as honest and conscientious and sincere in their belief that they are benefiting themselves and those they represent as are the men on the other side who favor the industrial form of organization. The craft unions have benefited the organized workers of this country materially in the past. It is simply a question of how much longer they can continue to benefit them in the matter at least of keeping up wages, to accompany the rise in prices, and reducing the hours of labor in the various

establishments where they are employed. That is a question that only the future will determine. But I have found this, Mr. Chairman, especially during the past half-dozen years, that those who profess to be in favor of the industrial form of organization were seldom if ever found upon the battleground where the battle for industrialism must be made, and that is in organized labor. They tell us from the outside what to do in the matter of conducting the battle upon the industrial field. But here is the situation: The few Socialists who are in the trades union movement have been preaching industrial unionism long before some of the most earnest advocates of it now ever thought of it. And the Socialists in the trades union movement, as I know full well, are generally the ones who are the first to feel the black-list lash of the combined capitalist forces of the United States. They are the first to be opposed by capitalism. Secondly, they are generally secretly or openly opposed by old line trades unionists. Thirdly, our own Socialist friends are indifferent to the struggles of the Socialists who are fighting for industrialism in the trades union movement, and desert—they take their playthings and go home, and refuse to fight the fight that will be necessary to establish industrialism upon the industrial field of America.

DEL. McDEVITT (Cal.): I am the only member of the Western Federation of Miners who has tried to get the floor.

I want first to point out to this convention that Comrade Hunter's argument was directed entirely to some amendment that might have been but has not been made. There has been no attempt nor desire to dictate to anybody. Comrade Hunter's knowledge of language must be as keen as mine and he must realize the important distinction between pointing out and dictating. And I want to point to him now—I am sorry if this is dictation—I want to point out to him that the amendment says specifically, "But we realize that it is the duty of the Socialist Party to point out to the workers"—that is, to point out to those people to whom we are obliged to point out all that we know of the Socialist philosophy in the political and industrial field.

Comrade Hayes says that we have been preaching industrial unionism lo,

these many years. Yes, and I say it is our duty to continue to preach industrial unionism; and now, when the issue of industrial unionism is really made, now when the issue is up, is this the time to discontinue to preach industrial unionism? All this amendment asks is a declaration of our realization that it is our duty to point out that we believe in the industrial form of organization as best suited to working class solidarity that is needed for success in the industrial struggles of labor under the present concentrated methods of production. Do we believe that? Every Socialist in the party knows that is the case. Why not declare it, then, to those who don't know it? The resolution of the committee covers the entire ground, except the one most important feature of the whole case. There is absolutely no declaration whatever as to the principle of industrial unionism, as to the principle of the industrial form of organization. This, it seems to me, is the least that we can do. We should at least declare that we realize it is our duty to stand for industrial solidarity in the industrial field as well as political solidarity in the political field.

This is not the last time that we shall bear of the principle of industrial unionism, nor is it the first time we have heard of it. But this is the time, comrades of this convention, for us to say at least that we realize that it is our duty to continue as we have done, and we propose from now on to continue to point out to the workers wherever we meet the workers the necessity of solidarity wherever they are organized industrially or politically.

DEL. STIRTON (Mich.): I am unable to understand the logic by which a convention of a working class political party that went out of its way to pass a resolution on the subject of temperance can be said to be going out of its proper sphere of activity to pass a resolution on the subject of labor organizations as contemplated in this amendment. We have not gone out of our way and are not proposing to go out of our way in expressing ourselves as to our preference for one form of labor organization rather than another. We are not going out of our way to take up this subject. We find it in our way and we have to take it up. There is no subject more vital today with relation to this whole work-

ing class movement than the question of labor organizations, on which we find two contending forces here.

For this reason I deem the amendment highly proper, that there is not a Socialist in the world today who can indicate, even with a relative degree of clearness, how we can bring about the co-operative commonwealth except along the lines suggested by the amendment, and that is by the industrial organization of the workers. Political institutions are not adapted to the administration of industry. Only industrial organizations are adapted to the administration of the affairs of the co-operative commonwealth that we are working for. Only the industrial form of organization offers us even a theoretical constructive Socialist program. There is no constructive Socialism except in industrial unionism.

I was also sorry to think that this convention would be swayed very largely in the matter of refraining even from pointing out the superiority of the industrial form of organization—I should be very sorry to think that we should be swayed by opportunist considerations, that by refusing to point this out we should get more votes. I should be sorry if that were the case. It would be the very essence of opportunism, and Bryanism and Hearstism. I know of no argument that can be brought to this convention in favor of our absolute silence on this matter, other than that offered by the delegates who intimate that we can get more votes by being absolutely silent. I know of no argument along that line that has not already been worn threadbare by those who speak in the name of Bryan and Hearst, when they say we should keep out of the Socialist movement because we have no hope of electing a Socialist president, and why not support us and elect good men, and after a while Bryanism and Hearstism will evolve into Socialism. Bye and bye! I recognize the parallelism between those arguments. They are one and the same argument. And bearing in mind all these propositions, the amendment simply points out the fact, calls attention to the fact, and we are not going outside of our proper sphere and are not leaving our particular line of activity. Our broad line of activity is to destroy capitalist institutions and bring in the co-operative commonwealth. Very well! Here we find at our hand the means of

advancing constructive Socialism. I submit that we are not going outside our proper sphere in recognizing that these are the appropriate means, and they are at hand.

DEL. LEE (N. Y.): I have first to say one word in reply to the delegate who spoke just before me. It is not perhaps in the best of taste, or in the best of comradely feeling, or in the best interests of this convention, that a delegate who rises to support a certain motion should charge those who oppose it with being influenced only by a desire to get votes. I repel that charge as being absolutely false. We are here to stand for what we believe to be the right position of the Socialist Party.

Now, comrades, let me call your attention, in the first place, to the hodgepodge that you would make of this resolution if you adopt this amendment. You first declare that the Socialist Party recognizes the necessity of the autonomy of the union movement in the economic field, just as it maintains its own autonomy in the political field; and then you go on to say that notwithstanding this, we tell you union men that you ought to organize your unions on such and such a plan.

I wonder what the comrades would say if at a convention of the American Federation of Labor they should adopt a resolution telling us how the Socialist Party should govern ourselves, telling us that we ought to overthrow our state autonomy rule, or that we ought to uphold our state autonomy rule, or telling us anything that we ought to do in our struggle for political supremacy. We would tell the American Federation of Labor to attend to their business in the economic field and we would attend to our business in the political field.

We stand for just what we say there. As I said introducing this resolution, we hold that it is not the business of this party to tell union workingmen how they should be organized or how they should act as unionists. It is our business to support them in their fights against their capitalist opponents. It is our business to help to make Socialists of them on the political field.

On the other hand, it is not the business of the American Federation of

Labor, or the Western Federation of Miners, or the Industrial Workers of the World, to tell us how we shall manage or should manage our affairs in the political field. It is their business, when they understand that it is to their interest to do so, to support us in the political field, and to organize, to bring about the best methods of action in their own field that they possibly can in view of all the experience that they have there.

Comrades, I want a consistent declaration sent out. I want a declaration sent out here that the world will know is a declaration for workingmen wherever they are struggling in any organization. (Long continued applause.)

I want a declaration sent out that cannot be used by Mr. Gompers to attack the Industrial Workers of the World; and I want a resolution that cannot be used, in the name of the Socialist Party, by the Industrial Workers of the World to attack the American Federation of Labor. (Loud applause.) We know this, comrades, that the Supreme Court of the United States, President Roosevelt, the Employers' Associations, and the Republican and Democratic parties are not fighting any particular labor organization. We recognize the fact that the capitalist organizations of this country and their friends, and their courts, and their soldiers, and their president, are not using their law and order methods against one form of labor organization. They are using them against the Western Federation of Miners, and they are using them against the American Federation of Labor; and, comrades, we stand for both against the capitalists.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that we adopt this amendment. Those in favor of that motion will say aye; those opposed, no. The noes have it.

(Cries of "Division!")

THE CHAIRMAN: Those in favor of the amendment will raise their hands and keep them up until counted. Those who are opposed raise their hands. The amendment has been lost by a vote of 48 in favor and 138 against.

The committee's report was then adopted.

Adjourned until 2 o'clock p. m.

AFTERNOON SESSION

Chairman Clark called the convention to order at 2 o'clock p. m.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Resolutions Committee is ready to finish its report, and if there is no objection we will hear it.

DEL. SPARGO, reporting for Committee on Resolutions: Comrade Chairman and comrades, the Resolutions Committee has a number of important resolutions to report to the convention. Some of the resolutions are so important that I hope we shall be able to secure very close attention to the report.

To get rid of some of the minor matters first—that is, matters upon which there will be less division of opinion—here is a resolution which to the delegates of the several states is a matter of almost vital importance to our organization. I will read it:

OPPRESSIVE PRIMARY LAWS.

"Whereas, In several states, through the operation of discriminating primary laws, minority parties are practically disfranchised and their resources are drained by the exaction of excessive and prohibitory fees; and

"Whereas, Individual states are unable to pay both the fees and the cost of fighting the law, therefore be it

"Resolved, That this convention recommends to the National Executive Committee that the national organization give such aid as is consistent with party finance to states that are trying to have these laws declared unconstitutional."

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the committee, I move the adoption of that resolution.

The motion was seconded and the resolution adopted.

DEPRECATION OF VIOLENCE.

DEL. SPARGO: A resolution relating to the matter of violence and physical force in the working class movement:

"The present industrial depression has reduced a large number of men and women to acute distress through lack of employment, and many of these, not

knowing how to express their indignation and revolt, are easily led by detectives, police and other agents of the capitalist class into acts of violence.

"We hold that any such violence on the part of the working people not only results in injuring their cause, but in helping the ruling class to maintain its power.

"We therefore urge all who desire the triumph of the working class to refrain from violence and from words inciting to violence, and to put all their energy into the economic fight waged by the unions, and the political fight waged by the Socialist Party." (Applause.)

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the committee, I move the adoption of that resolution. (Seconded.)

DEL. O'NEILL (Wyo.): I would like to move to amend that resolution so as to make it show that we want to use our judgment in handling our affairs so as not to incite violence, instead of making it appear that the laboring class at present is represented by us as inciting to violence.

THE CHAIRMAN: Won't you please formulate your amendment just as you want it, if you desire to make an amendment?

DEL. O'NEILL: Well, that is the sense of it. I want that to appear, that the Socialist Party is working to educate the laborers so that they will not resort to violence.

DEL. SPARGO: The chairman of the committee would suggest to the comrade that that is specifically provided in the resolution itself.

The motion to adopt the resolution was then carried.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): I want to be recording as voting no on this resolution; Slobodin of New York.

TYRANNICAL ACTS AGAINST MEXICAN LABOR LEADERS.

DEL. SPARGO: Another resolution:

"Whereas, The leaders of the working class revolt in Mexico against economic and political tyranny, having been driven from Mexico by threats of im-

prisonment and death for their devotion to working class interests in connection with a certain uprising and other revolts of the workers against the master class; and

"Whereas, These men have been arrested in this country without warrant of law and held in jail for nearly a year on trumped-up charges of conspiracy to organize an armed force to invade Mexico; and

"Whereas, This persecution of labor leaders by the capitalist class of the republics of the United States and Mexico constitutes an assault upon the entire working class of both countries, menacing such political rights as the workers still retain; be it therefore

"Resolved, That we condemn the action of the officials of both countries, and pledge our support to the defense of Magon, Villeral, Rivera and Sarabia against the persecution of the master class."

On behalf of the committee, I move the adoption of that resolution. (Seconded.)

DEL. HOEHN (Mo.): I am not speaking against the resolution, but I would like to get some information, either from the committee or from the comrades who want to introduce the resolution. I notice that the name Sarabia is mentioned in the resolution. Sarabia used to publish a Spanish paper in St. Louis, but he had no connection whatever with the—

THE CHAIRMAN: Please state what information it is you desire.

DEL. HOEHN: Well, before I can ask for the information I must give you my information, so that I can get the proper answer. But while in St. Louis he had no connection whatever with the Socialist Party, nor did he have any connection with organized labor. I should like to know in what relation those three men stand to the Socialist Party or the labor movement in California, before I vote on this question.

DEL. SPARGO: The chairman of the Resolutions Committee desires to state that the information asked for can best be given by Comrade Johns of California.

DEL. JOHNS (Cal.): Sarabia, Villeral, Rivera and Magon are not connected with the Socialist Party nor with the labor union movement of California, but all four of these men have given

their best energies and very nearly their lives in an attempt to organize labor in a country where labor organizations practically have been impossible because of the tyranny of the master class in that country. Sarabia was secretary of the organization in this country after the failure of what is known as the Menol uprising; and the Menol movement was an attempt to organize the Mexican miners, and was altogether a feeble movement, but the opinion of Colonel W. C. Green was that it would tend to riot.

At the time the organization began, the importation of Pinkerton detectives from this country to provoke riot was begun. At the same time there was gathered in Arizona a number of men under the generalship of—it doesn't matter, a deserter from the German army—who was employed by Colonel W. C. Green to organize a force on the border of Arizona to be ready to invade Mexico at the time the Mexican government or the sovereign of Sonora in Mexico should call for aid against the uprising that was being engineered by Colonel Green and General Festelon and the other men interested in the Menol mines. The stocks were sold at that time for what could be got for them. Then began stories telling of alleged friction between the Mexican miners and the American miners, and then when the revolt finally was forced by the trouble makers, by the hired Pinkertons, reports went out which had been carefully prepared for by advance information. A report went out that there was a clash between the Mexican miners and the Americans in Sonora. Also it was stated in the papers that Mexico was in a state of revolution, and then the use that was made of that revolution was to buy back the stock that had been sold at a high price, to buy them back for about 10 per cent of what they were sold for. That is the history of the Menol uprising, in brief. It was used to turn the minds of the American workers against the Mexican workers so that at any time the political uprising should come in Mexico to throw off the rule of the masters and make labor union organization possible in Mexico it would be easy to get volunteers for the American army that was to invade Mexico and fight against the possibility of organizing labor in any

way in the republic of Mexico. These men are not members of labor organizations in the United States, but they are the leaders of the movement to organize labor in Mexico. One of the men arrested, Comrade Villeral, was for more than two years a member of the Socialist Party in Los Angeles, but asked for his release. His feeling, and that of every other Mexican Socialist who has come from Mexico, has been that this labor union, this revolt as a means of organizing labor, is the only movement possible in Mexico. Effort after effort has been made to organize a Socialist movement there, and it has been ruthlessly stamped out. Whenever the Mexican Socialists go from California to Mexico they join the Liberal party there because it is the only movement possible for them in the fight to gain the privilege of organization at any time for the welfare of the working class.

DEL. HOEHN: The information is satisfactory, and I hope the resolution will be adopted unanimously.

The question was put on the adoption of the resolution, and it was carried unanimously.

IMMIGRATION.

DEL. SPARGO: The next resolution is on the question of immigration. The chairman desires to say that on this question of immigration the report of your committee is a unanimous one. There was a very sharp dividing line in the committee upon the question, as I presume there would be in any number of Socialists gathered together. There was submitted to the Resolutions Committee a definite resolution looking to the endorsement of the principle of Asiatic exclusion. There was a good deal of protest against it. Your committee took the position of trying to find a middle ground upon which all could agree, and invited both sides of the issue to appear before it. In addition to that, they have taken into consultation a large number of delegates who have pronounced views upon the matter. I make this announcement merely to say that this resolution which I am to read is not merely by unanimous consent the agreement of the committee, but that the partisans on both sides, the extremists on both sides of the question of immigration, have agreed to it as being a satisfactory statement to make at this time at this convention. Therefore, it

is our hope that what seemed to be a matter which would involve us in endless debate may be disposed of very promptly. I ask your attention while I read the resolution:

"The Socialist Party, in convention assembled, declares that the fundamental principle of Socialism is the struggle between the exploiting and exploited classes. The controlling principle of the political Socialist movement is the economic interest of the workers.

"In conformity with this principle the National Convention of the Socialist Party affirms that the working class must protect itself against whatever imperils its economic interests. The mass importation by the capitalist class of foreign workers with lower standard of living than those generally prevailing may in some instances become as serious to the working class of the nation as an armed invasion would be to the nation itself.

"To deny the right of the workers to protect themselves against injury to their interests, caused by the competition of imported foreign laborers whose standards of living are materially lower than their own, is to set a bourgeois Utopian ideal above the class struggle.

"This principle compels us to resolutely oppose all immigration which is subsidized or stimulated by the capitalist class, and all contract labor immigration, as well as to support all attempts of the workers to raise their standards of living. It does not, however, commit the Socialist Party to any attitude upon specific legislation looking to the exclusion of any race or races as such.

"The question of racial differences involved in the agitation for the exclusion of Asiatic immigrants this convention does not feel itself competent to decide upon at this time in the absence of a scientific investigation of the matter.

"Therefore, we recommend that in view of the great importance of this subject to the life of the workers of the nation, a special committee of five members be elected at this convention to carefully study and investigate the whole subject of immigration, in all its aspects, racial no less than economic, to publish from time to time such data as they may gather, and to report to the next convention of the party."

The reading of the resolution was followed with applause.

DEL. SPARGO: Mr. Chairman, I move, on behalf of the committee, the adoption of that resolution. (Seconded.)

DEL. WOODBY (Cal.): It is generally supposed that the western people, those living on the Pacific slope, are almost as a unit opposed to Oriental immigration. I am not saying that those living on the western slope oppose them, but where Oriental immigration comes to the western coast it is supposed that the people of the west are in favor of their exclusion. I am in favor of throwing the entire world open to the inhabitants of the world. (Applause.) There are no foreigners, and cannot be unless some person came down from Mars, or Jupiter, or some place. I stand on the declaration of Thomas Paine when he said "The world is my country." (Applause.) It would be a curious state of affairs for immigrants or the descendants of immigrants from Europe themselves to get control of affairs in this country, and then say to the Oriental immigrants that they should not come here. So far as making this a mere matter of race, I disagree decidedly with the committee, that we need any kind of a committee to decide this matter from a scientific standpoint. We know what we think upon the question of race now as well as we would know two years from now or any other time.

And so far as reducing the standard of living is concerned, the standard of living will be reduced anyhow. You know as well as I do that either the laborer will be brought to the job or the job will be taken to the laborer. Understand? We will either have to produce things as cheap as they can be produced upon foreign soil or the means of production will be carried to the Orient and there the thing will be done. The natural tendency of capitalism is to reduce the standard of living; the standard of living will be reduced anyhow.

Now, listen: It seems to me if we take any stand opposed to any sort of immigration that we are simply playing the old pettifogging trick of the Democrats and Republicans, and will gain nothing by it. (Applause.) I believe it is opposed, as I understand, to the principles of international Socialism. I do not pretend to say that the international Socialist organization takes square ground as to what we should say on the question, but to me Socialism is based,

if anything, upon the Brotherhood of Man. This stand that we take in opposition to any sort of immigration is opposed to the very spirit of the Brotherhood of Man. I hope, therefore, that all that part of the committee's report which imposes a restriction on immigration will be stricken out by this convention. It ought to be done; in good faith it ought to be done, because, in the first place, the Socialists are organized in Japan; they are getting organized in China; they will soon be operating in every civilized nation on earth. And are the Socialists of this country to say to the Socialists of Germany, or the Socialists of Sweden, Norway, Japan, China, or any other country, that they are not to go anywhere on the face of the earth? It seems to me absurd to take that position. Therefore, I hope and move that any sort of restriction of immigration will be stricken out of the committee's resolution. (Applause.)

DEL. MILLER (Colo.): Comrade Chairman, there is another thing that is to be considered in the question of immigration, and that is the class struggle, and that any action on the part of the working class which is in accord with the actions and intentions and interests of the capitalist class is in direct conflict with the interests of the workers. (Applause.) And whenever you take any action that puts your sanction upon the efforts of the manufacturers to bring the hordes of either Europe or Asia to this soil you take your stand for the lowering of civilization. (Applause.)

I want to say to you, my comrades, that brotherhood means something more than a mere mouthing of phrases about that question. There are some limits to be considered. We know the purpose of the mass importation of foreign labor. It is to bring American labor down to the same miserable standard which they occupy. I want to say to you again, on questions of that kind take men of the highest intellectual standard of the working classes of Europe, and they will stay at home to lead the fight in their own country, where they understand the problem and can aid the most in bringing about the brotherhood of man. You and I know that strong, able, intellectual men acquainted with their surroundings at home, among their people, can accomplish vastly more for the uplifting of those people than they can do when

they come a few thousand miles away, in a strange country, surrounded by strange conditions and people speaking a strange language.

I want to say to you again, on the question of immigration, that there are biological reasons as well as sociological and economic ones to be considered upon this matter. (Applause.) There has never been a mixture and amalgamation of races that did not end disastrously for those amalgamated. (Applause.) And I want to say to you that it is capitalism that fosters and creates conditions of that kind. People that belong to the same race, unless there are economic reasons for mingling with others, naturally draw those lines pretty closely, and while they may cross those lines in associating and in exchanging ideas, still their life is spent among the people of a common descent. I take it that no mere sentiments or ideals of the present can wipe out the result of centuries of blood and thought and struggle. There are some things along that line that we must consider very carefully. Remember, above all things else, the class struggle lies at the bottom of the Socialist propaganda. It seems to me sometimes that we forget that, in the mouthing of mere sentimental phrases. True, we want also to promote the brotherhood of man. How can we do that? Not by sinking mankind to a common level. The delegate says we will have to take the man to the job or the job will go to the man. I want to tell him he will have to change some of nature's laws before he can take the ore out of the Rocky Mountains to the Chinaman (applause), or before he can bring the coal out of Illinois, out of Pennsylvania, and take it over to the Jap, or to the Greek to dig. It is true that this transporting can be done in some of the phases of manufacturing, in textile operations, etc. But let us look at all questions of this kind calmly and considerately. Above all, we must solve the problems of the people of our own country. This problem comes to us with the most pressing weight, and other men in other countries will meet their problems as best they may. The working class of the world has a common purpose, a common cause, but that does not mean that we shall ignore or neglect these great primal facts. It does not mean at any stage of the game that we shall ever clasp hands

with the employer and seek to give our aid to the aims which he seeks to achieve. It is disastrous to the working class whenever that is the result. I think we would do well to appoint a committee upon this question. I am very nearly in complete accord with the report of the Resolutions Committee. Perhaps I would have gone a little bit farther on the question of Asiatic immigration and Asiatic civilization.

DEL. HOEHN (Mo.): Comrades, I endorse the first part of the committee's report. I oppose the second part. In the first part of the report the committee states something definite; certain facts are presented. In the second part, in the concluding part of the report, the recommendation is made that no action be taken today, but that we defer final action to four years hence, to our next National Convention. Now, I wish to inform the members of the committee and the delegates on the floor of the convention that the class struggle will not be fought in the co-operative commonwealth in twenty-five or fifty or a hundred years from now, but the class struggle is here today and you will have to fight it today. (Applause.)

DEL. SPARGO: A point of order. The report does nothing of the kind that Delegate Hoehn suggests. The part that we propose to take definite action on is the class struggle. On the disputed question of racial antagonism as distinct from the class struggle, we say, "Let us study that first." We do not propose to postpone the class struggle.

DEL. HOEHN: Well, I stand corrected to that extent. But, nevertheless, I want to impress upon the minds of the delegates to this convention that today the class struggle in this country is on.

DEL. SPARGO: We recognize that.

DEL. HOEHN: The class struggle is on today, and with the permission of my friend from Illinois, Comrade Lewis, I will say the class struggle is on between capitalism and the working class. (Laughter.)

DEL. LEWIS: You are responsible, and not me.

DEL. HOEHN: Now, as Comrade Miller from Colorado has very properly pointed out, whenever the capitalist class, whenever the American Manufacturers' Association, and the Citizens' Industrial Alliance stand for a certain demand, organized labor and the Socialists

of the country ought to be very careful not to fall in line with those corporation representatives. I assure you that nothing would be more welcome today than to open the gates on all sides and admit the millions and millions of poor slaves into this country, so that the capitalists could break up every labor union in the country. And I want to say right here, comrades, it would only require about 250,000 Japanese mine workers to be imported in a few months to break up the entire United Mine Workers' Union of America. We as Socialists cannot stand for such a proposition. The Socialist convention, before it adjourns, must take definite action. It has to consider the demand made by the great mass of organized workers. Now, I want to refer to our friend from California. I have noticed that whenever an important question is up our friends from California stand on the class struggle, but unfortunately for our comrades from California, they do not stand on the class struggle, nor do they sit on the class struggle; they are lying on the class struggle, and lying up in the air. (Laughter.) And I want to say to you that the class struggle on the Pacific coast, the class struggle in Los Angeles, and the class struggle in the State of Washington, is going on fiercer than in any part of the United States, and our comrades on the Pacific coast will have to take a little different stand on such an important proposition.

DEL. YOUNG (Pa.): Comrade Chairman and comrades, when we go into a skin game we must play the game in accordance with the rules of the game. When we go into the game of capitalism we must play that game in accordance with the rules of capitalism. If we try to inaugurate the great and noble ideas of Socialism in a capitalist community, just as surely as we are in the class struggle we are going to be ground under the wheels of this capitalist juggernaut.

Now, there was a law made before the law of the class struggle, and that was the law of self-preservation. Every workingman in this country is first bound by the law of self-preservation, and if immigration of foreign peoples who are below the standard of living in the United States is allowed to swamp this country with cheap labor from all over the world, just so sure will the

standard of living of the workingmen of the United States be reduced. Now, that is not a theory; it is not an opinion; it is a fact. And it is with facts that we have at this time got to grapple. Personally, I would be in favor of absolutely stopping all immigration into this country. (Hisses and manifestations of disapproval.) I think it would be the best thing for the American worker.

(Cries of "Sit down.")

DEL. YOUNG: Have I the floor, Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us have order until the comrade closes.

DEL. YOUNG: But the report of this committee I take as a most admirable report, and I can only urge with all the power that I have the adoption of that report. And the moment that we take an extreme ground on either side, either for the unlimited influx of labor from foreign countries or for the absolute exclusion of foreign peoples, why, that moment we will come into clash with either the labor interests of this country or the labor interests of outside countries. But our first duty is to the laboring class, the working class of the United States, and not to that of Europe or China, or any other country under the sun. We are here to represent the working class of the United States, and we are bound to do the best we can for the working class of the United States. I strongly urge the adoption of this resolution.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT (Wash.): Undoubtedly the hissing that was done here a few minutes ago is a good example of those advocates of brotherly love who wish to bring that brotherly love while the class struggle is going on; a very good example. It proves the statement of my friend, Comrade Young of Pennsylvania, that not only is the first law of life, namely, the law of self-preservation, the main law, the main material law, but when it comes to the preservation of one's personal ideas the self-preservation of his ideas is also a law of human nature, and we do not remember our brotherly love to our fellow men when anybody crosses us in our ideas. (Applause.)

The brotherhood of man is for a future state of society. While my friend from California is talking about the brotherhood of man, thinking about the brotherhood of man, dreaming about the brotherhood of man, the capitalist

class is doing something else. (Applause.) The capitalist class don't talk only or think or dream about the brotherhood of man. The capitalist class has its eyes upon the working class. The capitalist class has got its eyes not only upon the working class of America, but also upon the working class of foreign lands. The capitalist class is a class which wishes to preserve not only its ultimate interests, but also its immediate interests, and the capitalist class will preserve its immediate interests by importing not only labor into America, but by exporting its industries to foreign lands. Now, we are not concerned as to whether or not the capitalist will export its industries into foreign lands—but we are confronted with the fact as to whether or not the capitalist class will import foreign labor into the United States right now. There is nothing more to be said, because our friend—(laughter)—I don't yield the floor yet.

THE CHAIRMAN: The comrade has the floor.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT: There is nothing more to be said—

A DELEGATE: Then sit down.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us have order till the comrade finishes.

A DELEGATE: A point of order. He said there is nothing more to be said, so why doesn't he sit down?

THE CHAIRMAN: You will have to ask him about it.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT: Comrade Young of Pennsylvania and Comrade Miller of Colorado have stated fully the position of those who are in favor of exclusion, and anything more on my part would seem simply to be repetition. But I wanted to make that one point, the fact that the brotherhood of man has no place in a capitalist society in which the class struggle is the main factor.

DEL. SMITH (Tex.): There is no doubt but that there may be a great deal said on both sides of this question by parties holding extreme views. There might be a great deal said. Now, we have heard from Pennsylvania and from Washington. I am from Texas, a sort of middle ground, you know, yet I have got very decided views. The resolution does not conform to all my views fully, but I am charmed with the wisdom set forth in that resolution, and I believe that it will have a tendency to harmonize

all parties. Now, I first started into the business, the harmonizing business—

DEL. HERMAN (Wash.): I rise to a point of personal privilege; that we have heard four speeches in favor of the resolution and only one against.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your point of personal privilege is not well taken.

DEL. HERMAN: I ask that we find out the position that the delegate rising is going to take.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am not a mind reader.

DEL. SMITH: About thirty-five years ago, having been born and raised south of this city a few miles, I went down south, married a Mississippi girl, and settled the question between the North and South. And now, if we can harmonize the East and West on this question we will be doing a great thing, and I do not believe if we were to fight two hours over this question we would come any nearer than is to be found in that resolution. I stand for the resolution.

DEL. LEWIS (Ill.): Comrade Chairman and fellow delegates, I am in favor of the resolution proposed by the committee. It does not go as far as I would like it to go, but I believe it goes as far as it is possible to carry this convention. The principal argument made in favor of exclusion is that oriental immigration would lower civilization, in the language of Comrade Miller. I have lived some four years on the Pacific slope, visited all its principal cities and enjoyed the hospitality of most of its jails, and I have come into contact with the orientals in those cities. You cannot get a Chinese cook on the Pacific coast for less than nearly double the wages of a white cook. (Applause.) When you talk to a Chinaman about cooking there is only one phrase he will consent to mention to you, and that is "seventy dolls month," and he will not work for \$69. You can get white cooks in ship loads at \$30 or \$40 a month. In the city of Bellingham, on the northern part of the Pacific coast, there is the largest salmon cannery in the world, operated by white men. There is only about three months of the year of a season, and they only work about two or three days a week. During that season, when the white wage slaves began to protest that at least during the season they ought to be paid double time, for they were there

day and night for two days a week, the employers responded by bringing a shipload of Chinamen from San Francisco to take their places. The Chinamen were shrewd enough to contract that unless they decided to stay they would be shipped back. They came; they worked less than one week, and then they issued their manifesto to the employers, and they said: "During the season we are willing to work two days and two nights when the catch is in, and loaf the rest of the week. But, working or loafing, from the beginning of the season to the conclusion our wages must be paid for every day, or we go back." (Applause.) And the employers said, "That is a bigger demand than the white men ever made," and they took the Chinamen back to San Francisco.

A DELEGATE: Good for the Chinamen!

DEL. LEWIS: As for the Jap, the Japanese workers of southern California, on the railroads applied to the American Federation of Labor for a charter. These men are willing to organize, and once they become familiar with the country they would make better organized workmen than the white man. (Applause.) No Chinaman ever breaks a contract twice, and very rarely once. These men applying for a charter were refused one by the representatives of organized labor in America—one of the most treasonable acts ever committed in the name of the working class. (Applause.) I have only one minute and a half. I want to tell Comrade Wagenknecht that is only possible in a capitalist society. True, we can not invite all men to unite, because we are divided into classes, but we can invite all the workers of all the world to unite. (Applause.) As for me, on this question class runs deeper than either blood or race (applause), and I say to the Japanese workman and the Japanese Socialist looking across the Pacific to this convention and asking, shall we include them with our European workmen and consider them a part of the Socialist international movement, this is my answer: We are exploited with a common exploitation; we are enslaved in a common slavery; and so far as I am concerned, my yellow working wage slaves and comrades, we will stand or fall together. (Applause.)

DEL. UNTERMANN (Idaho). I be-

lieve in the international solidarity of the working class, and yield to no Socialist on this floor in teaching and practicing such solidarity to the point to which it is possible. But I do not believe in international solidarity to the point of cutting my own throat. So long as this question is discussed merely from the economic point of view, we necessarily come to one set of conclusions; we turn in a circle and get nowhere. Every Socialist writer of any authority has always declared that the Socialist Party considers not merely the economic point of view, but all phases of social life. But when the race question comes into discussion this reasonable declaration is quickly forgotten and the whole debate turns upon the economic factor, without taking the slightest notice of the racial aspect of this question.

This is not only an economic question, but also a race question, and I am not afraid to say so. I believe in the authority of the International Congress, but I do not believe in international dogma. The International Congress is not a church council whose declaration we must accept willingly or unwillingly. I am not going to submit to the mere theoretical declarations of a set of European intellectuals who have never had any actual touch with the race issue. Those comrades who merely consider the economic point of view forget that every argument that can be brought against oriental exclusion from that point of view can also be brought against the immigration of any other race. Only when we take the race issue into consideration along with the economic factors do we get to any satisfactory solution of this question.

I want to ask those comrades who believe in unrestricted immigration of the orientals why they do not demand a vote and homesteads for them? If they demand a vote for the orientals, what will be the consequence for the Socialist Party? Every one familiar with conditions in the southern states knows very well what would be the fate of the Socialist Party if we attempted to organize mixed locals of colored and white people down there. Every one familiar with conditions on the Pacific and in the Rocky Mountain states knows that the same result would follow there if we attempted to organize mixed locals of orientals and whites. The oriental la-

borers are of no use to us in our political struggle, even if we could organize them and educate them as easily as laborers from other countries. The orientals have no home. They cannot help to fight the political class struggle, and if we demand homesteads for them what will be the result for the white race? How much of the United States are you going to turn over to them? And if they fill them up, how much more and how much more?

I am determined that my race shall not go the way of the Aztec and the Indian. I believe in the brotherhood of man, regardless of races, but I do not believe in extending that brotherhood to the point of eliminating myself voluntarily from the struggle for existence and turning over this country to my brothers of other races. I am determined that my race shall be supreme in this country and in the world. (Applause.)

For this reason I am in favor of the adoption of the report of the committee, and in favor of the appointment of a committee which shall study this question. (Applause.)

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): Comrade Chairman and comrades, whatever I may have done, I have not taken up very much of your time so far, and I am not going to take up much of your time. (A voice, "Good.") I am not going to make a long speech. I may not even want five minutes. But we do not want to decide this question on second-hand ideas. The Socialist movement, the International movement, was not founded on second-hand reasons. It does not rest on second-hand reasons. Our basis is materialistic. Our basis is scientific. Let us decide this question as we do every other question, on a scientific and materialistic basis. I will not go over any of the ground that the others have covered. I fully agree with everything that Guy Miller said, and I fully agree with what Comrade Hoehn and some of the others said.

There are about 500,000,000 Chinamen in China. We get now about a million immigrants from Europe. They are of our own race and make-up, in a measure, and yet aren't they lowering the standard of living for the American proletariat? Anybody who tells me that they do not is deceiving himself and he is deceiving us. They do. But we know that in the second generation they will

become part of us, that they will become the same as we are. A good many of them become part of us even in the first generation, for they are of the same make-up and they have the same civilization. There is very little difference between the German workman coming over here and the American workman. The main difference is in language. A good many of our German comrades know a good deal more than we do; in some respects we may even learn from some of our Russian comrades. (Applause.)

But, comrades, the Asiatic question is entirely different. The Asiatics, while their civilization may be older, while they may be smarter, than the American or European—that is so much more reason—

(Confusion on the convention floor.)

DEL. BERGER: Comrades, I have listened to you, and I want you to listen to me. On the contrary, if their adaptability is so much greater and their needs are so much smaller than ours, that is the more reason why we have to defend ourselves. This is a practical question for the working class. China could send over about two million coolies every year and not feel it. They could send over here five millions every year if our capitalists should want them, and China would not miss them. But we would feel it. If you permit them to come over here just for fifteen years at two millions a year you will wipe out our civilization simply by their lower standard of living, by their power to live on a great deal less than you can. There would be a quiet war, but a most terrible war, waged against us—a war of extermination, on economic lines. The white race could not propagate, could not exist in a competition of that kind with the yellow race. That is all I have to say on this.

I want to consider this simply from a working class standpoint, and no other. We are willing to help the Japs in every way; we are willing to help the Chinese in every way. By pulling us down to their level they do not help themselves in any way, but they make us miserable. Your first duty, comrades, is to your class and to your family. Because your neighbor's house is burning, shall you set your own house on fire? No, say I. Defend your own house and then help your neighbor; that is the way.

DEL. SLAYTON (Pa.): I am go-

ing to try to keep as close to the main topic, the resolution, as possible. We can make academic speeches here, those of us who are able, for the time to come, and two days longer, on this question, and will then, perhaps, not have reached the matter that is before us. I admit everything that has been said relative to the brotherhood of man when taken upon its equitable basis, but I am forced to remind you of the story of the old champion abolitionist, Wendell Phillips, and the minister. The minister said, "I understand, Mr. Phillips, that you advocate the freedom of the black man." "Yes, I do," said Phillips. "Then why don't you go down south and preach it?" Phillips turned to him and said, "You are a minister, and I presume you believe in hell." "Oh, yes." "Wouldn't you like to see hell abolished?" "Yes," said the preacher. "Then," said Phillips, "why don't you go to hell and preach it?" (Laughter.)

I am reminded by you that our basis is the brotherhood of man, and I agree to it. But I want to remind you again that you can no more practice it, even though you do your best, until you remove the obstacles to the practice of it. You can no more practice it now than it would be possible to go up the side of a volcano. If I understand the resolution it distinctly states that we are in opposition to contract labor and not to voluntary immigration. If an immigrant is dissatisfied with his country and comes to America because he wants to come, there is no objection to that in that resolution; let him come. But, Mr. Chairman and comrades, when the American capitalists can do as they have done in the past, pass an appropriation of \$64,000 through the legislature or through the Congress, to pay for advertisements to be sent to Europe to bring immigrants here, advertisements that lie as to the conditions, and bring them here by hundreds of thousands to promote the interests of the capitalists, do you tell me then that we shall agree on the theory of the brotherhood of man, that we shall agree and accept that proposition? I say, if we do, it is not wise on our part, neither are we promoting in an elementary or any other manner the brotherhood of man. It is simply foolishness on our part. Contract labor, as I understand, is read distinctly in that resolution. If that is true, I am in favor of the resolution. If it had said in

broad, general terms, as some comrades have, that they are opposed to all immigration, I could understand all that, and I would be opposed to the resolution. But in this struggle of which you have said so much and so eloquently, the capitalists are out to do a certain thing, and we disagree and I disagree that they should do that thing in that way. Every immigrant, German, Asiatic, Caucasian, or whatever he may be, I do not care what he is, may be permitted to come to America if he comes on his own volition and with his own means, and rest assured I shall welcome him to the best of my ability, because if he is dissatisfied and comes here he makes a pretty good citizen as soon as he gets here, and the man will be ready to go and fight the capitalists. But I say that the Russian who stays in Russia is doing more to bring Socialism in Russia than the same man could do if he came to America. (Applause.) I want to say to you that the Russians there are about ready to overturn the throne of the czar; don't forget it. If he voluntarily comes I welcome him; but when they bring them by the hundreds of thousands, then they are neither helping the Americans nor helping the Russians. That is the point I want to make, and with that point I am perfectly satisfied. You can see, I think, my position. Brother Lewis says we will rise or fall together. I agree to that. How shall we save ourselves? By agreeing to the capitalist methods, or adopting some of our own?

DEL. PEISER (N. Y.): Comrade Chairman and comrade delegates, my local has instructed me to speak upon this question, and to speak against the admission of coolie and contract labor. Now, there is a point that has not been brought out by the ardent adherents of the admission of Japanese and Chinamen on the Pacific slope, and that point is this: In Africa, Cape Colony, or where the mines are, they have admitted coolie and Chinese labor. Has the price of labor gone up in East Africa or has it declined? I ask the comrade from the Pacific coast that question. There are no coolie laborers working for \$70 a month there. No, Comrade Arthur Morrow Lewis, but they are working for a far lower wage than the original workers in the mines of East Africa. It has certainly tended to lower the standard

of living among the white workingmen of East Africa, that is a fact. It is not going up in the air, but it is sinking, from what I have read and from the information that we have got.

Furthermore, to speak of the brotherhood of man is a very nice thing. I am looking ardently forward to the time when there will be a brotherhood of man among all the world, but every time I think of it I am thinking of the parson. I remember reading of a preacher that went out to the Indians with a Bible in one hand, and so forth. He spoke of the brotherhood of man to the Indians, and the Indians got his scalp. Now, fellow delegates, this is the way with the white workingman in this country today. We can talk of the brotherhood of man, and they are going to get our economic scalps if we talk so much about it without giving them a chance to work out their own salvation. I am a descendant, or rather the son of a German who emigrated to this country, but I believe that we, the emigrants that emigrated to this country, of the white race, are today working for a higher standard among the working class, while the yellow races are not doing so, and therefore I am in favor of keeping coolie labor away from the American shores until such time as they have a higher standard of living, until the time that they have worked their way up to our standard today; and therefore, Comrade Chairman and delegates, I am in favor of the adoption of the resolution as read.

DEL. MILLER (Nev.): I move an amendment to the resolution before the house. I move that this be incorporated with the resolution: We recognize that pending the success of the economic revolution on the political field, it may be wise and necessary to restrict immigration in order to protect labor from a complication from the Orient that proceeds from immigrants who do not enter this country for the purpose of establishing permanent homes. Do I obtain a second?

The amendment was seconded.

DEL. MILLER: Let me first say to you that this thing is not in opposition to the international resolution adopted at Stuttgart. I have it in my hand for the purpose, and I want to read two lines of it in the first part of the conclusion to that resolution: "To advise and assist the bonafide working men in their efforts," etc.

Now, there is a difference between the people who come here from Germany, from Brother Berger's home, and the people who come from China and Japan. You know and Comrade Lewis knows that they are coming all the time, thousands and tens of thousands of men, workingmen, not to be our brothers in blood, of one nature by race, but they are coming to America, not to establish homes and become a part of the proletarian revolution in the United States, but to earn some money and go back to their native land (applause)—of their own volition, to enjoy what they have made here, earned in competition with white labor, to spend it in a land where it costs only a fraction of what it does here to live, and at the behest of their comrades to take up arms in a war for capitalist purposes between capitalist governments. Now, I say Brother Lewis knows something of the brotherhood of man. I know something of it myself. But I know that if you want to emasculate the labor movement in the west, just stand for the immigration of all the people from the orient, if you please, and you will do it, and you will satisfy the capitalist masters of the Union. (Applause.) I do not know that this question is a question between the east and west in the ranks of the Socialist party. It has been said here and intimated that it is. I do not know that it would hurt any of our comrades in the east if this amendment should fail, if this convention should declare against immigration from the east. There is a difference between the people of European countries who come here to make a home and to become part of our movement, and who before they come, many of them, have better ideas of the Socialist movement than we have, and, on the other hand, people who come from the orient, and who intend to go back, who never establish homes here, who are different in many respects from the immigrants from European countries, and who never do help us in any way, shape or manner to bring about the emancipation of the working class of America; and until we bring about the emancipation of the working class of America we shall not be in a strong position to help the working class of China.

DEL. BERLYN (Ill.): It was some time ago that I came to this country. I am a foreigner. I remember that in 1850 in the streets of New York I saw

riots between the Knownothings and the Wideawakes, between those who were called the dark lantern men, who wanted to keep the foreigners out, and those who were in favor of a larger immigration. The argument on one side was that there were too many people in the country. We had at that time in the United States, according to the census, 31,000,000 people. We were told at that time that the standard of living would be reduced. But since that time the immigrants have come in an ever-increasing flow, but the organization of labor amongst the people has enabled the American workingmen to do something to raise the standard of living, in spite of the immense inflow. That is one side of the question.

But there is another side of the question—that wonderful class struggle that these people talk about and know nothing about. We must keep separate from the capitalists. When the Chinese exclusion act was enacted there was not even a socialist party; don't forget that. I belong to a different race than nine-tenths of you here. I am not only a foreigner by birth, but I am a Jew, so exclude them all—they are no good. Now, let me tell you; we want to keep the class struggle. It is a remarkable thing; the obliviousness of this convention is remarkable in one point. You don't know why the fleet of battleships has been sent to the Pacific. You forget all about that. You forget that both Democrats and Republicans are united on Japanese and Oriental exclusion, and you want us to blow the little whistle and say "Me, too." (Laughter and applause.) Now, I do not think that is the mission of the Socialist party. I believe in the resolution which says that a committee shall be appointed to investigate this matter, and even though we were to get that report inside of two years instead of four years, the exclusion acts will have been passed. There is, with all this talk about immigration, the most efficient exclusion act at work right now. The emigrants exceed the number of immigrants. (Applause.) If you want to exclude them, double up the force of the industrial depression. It is nonsensical to talk about people coming here because they come of their own free will. They utterly ignore the goad of the capitalist whip which sends the proletariat around the world. They ignore it. And then they want to tack

on a whole lot of stuff; investigate, and when the next convention comes the exclusion acts will be in full force. We won't elect socialists to the next congress, I am afraid, to affect the standing of the matter, for the unanimity of both capitalist parties on the question will settle the matter, for the coming of the sixteen battering rams that are floating in the Pacific will force them into silence, and we Socialists will proudly say they are doing our work. (Applause.) That is a great class struggle, if you want to chime in with the capitalists and say "Me, too." I have been in this country for sometime. I was here in the days when the abolition question was on, and when the enfranchisement question was up, and I am learning funny lessons. I have learned to look upon all men as equal. You may attempt in this body to make me unlearn it, but you cannot do it. (Applause.) I belong to a despised race. The idea of equality for all men regardless of race can only be accomplished by the Socialist party. (Applause.) But if we permit ourselves to go to work and tuck amendments to the proposition of "Workingmen of all countries, unite"—if you tuck amendments to that, then tuck a clause to the name of the Socialist party, the words "A d— lie."

DEL. ESTER NIEMINEN (Minn.): This question is really a waste of time. We seem to think we have got a Socialist government already. If we Socialists had the management of the United States government, then there would be reason for talking as to whether it would be of any benefit to have the Chinese or not. But now the way it is, you know the capitalists control us and we cannot do anything. If we say we want to exclude Oriental Immigration we cannot do it. If the capitalists want to bring them in, no trade union is strong enough to prevent it. If the capitalists cannot have immigration coming here, if they cannot have Chinamen come here they are going to take out their machinery and move their factories to China. That is what the great trusts are doing today. Even if the different unions become so strong that they cannot make their machinery here, that will make no difference, for the Europeans will then make the machinery. We know that if we try to stop it, if we do pass resolutions that we do not want the Chinaman here or

that we do not want the Japanese here, we know that if the capitalists think it is any benefit to them they will bring the Chinaman in.

But the capitalist class today realizes that it is more benefit to have European workingmen here than it is to have Chinese workingmen. Why? The American consumes more than a Chinaman, and the capitalist does not want any one that comes here and works and does not consume something. We undersell the Orientals and crowd them out of employment at home. Then they come here to seek work, but we good, honest Americans, and even some Socialists, want to starve them. And then we say all men are equal, of whatever color. Soon we will be saying all men are equal but Chinamen. I don't know where the women come in—I mean the Chinese women.

The only way we could reach a solution of this question would be through industrial unionism, and then we would be in danger of losing our dear capitalists, which is awful to think of. Our natural resources won't hold them here.

Another thing, if we do have the Chinaman it is not going to put the workingman out of work. We have found out that the last panic has made more Socialists than anything else, and if all the Japanese came here tomorrow and threw our workingmen out of work, I am sure that they would all be Socialists after a while. (Applause.) We know there are but two ways of making Socialists. The one we put into practice is through the brain. If we don't succeed, the capitalists put the other way into practice, through the stomach.

And here we have been talking like idiots, that we are going to shut out Oriental immigration, just as though we had the reins of government, just as though we controlled the whole country. Let us leave this question go and leave the capitalists do just as they see fit, and let us agitate among the workingmen ourselves. Get them to understand what we mean by Socialism, and after that we will organize the Chinese and let them come. I think it is a benefit. The more we get here the better. It is the capitalists that would prevent them coming out of their own countries, the European countries. You go to any European country, and on their farms

who do you see? Nothing but old men, some of them eighty years old. You do not find any young men. All those young men, as soon as they are eighteen or twenty, leave their own country and come to America. If the Japanese would all do that we would all be Socialists in America and we would not have to work as hard as we do now under the capitalist system.

The previous question was ordered.

DEL. SPARGO: I have been asked by Comrade Miller to fix where this amendment fits into the resolution proper. I will explain because the Secretary will be unable to read it. The resolution before the house, you remember, contains this clause: "Distinguishing between the economic issue and the race issue, the question of racial differences involved in the agitation for the exclusion of Asiatic Immigrants, this convention does not feel itself competent to decide upon at this time in the absence of a scientific investigation of the matter." The amendment proposes to leave out that clause and to insert this more positive statement: "That we recognize that pending the success of the economic resolution on the political field, it may be wise and necessary to restrict immigration in order to protect labor from a competition from the Orient that proceeds from immigrants who do not enter the country for the purpose of establishing permanent homes." That is the amendment.

DEL. KNOPFNAGEL (Ill.): Comrade Chairman and comrades, I want to state that I too as Comrade Berlyn, am not a German, nor a Russian, but one who has a long nose, and you know who it is. I belong to the despised race. I want to state here that from my very early childhood I was persecuted in Russia, not only as a Jew, but as one who tried to go against the Russian government. For this reason I am here, and upon this point I am opposed to this resolution. (Applause.) I want to ask you, comrades, suppose the Russians were Orientals, suppose they, the Russians, escaping from Siberia, came to America, would they be allowed to come here? A comrade here stated—he apparently is not a Russian and don't know anything about Russia—that the Russian Socialists should remain in Russia and can do more for Russia than those who are away from Russia. The comrades

should first go to Russia and learn the conditions there, and then they will find out that the Russian Socialist who is in America, cannot remain in Russia and propagate the principles of Socialism; he has to leave. Now, you are going to adopt a resolution in favor of the restriction of Oriental immigration. A delegate has been sneered at on this floor today because he spoke of the brotherhood of the working class. He expressed the sentiment of Karl Marx, "workingmen of the world, unite." That was not a handy phrase with Karl Marx. It may be a handy phrase with trade union socialists. (Applause.) When Karl Marx said "workingmen of the world, unite," he meant every word of it; he meant it in word and in spirit. Now, you are going to pass a resolution against Japan. We know that Japan is being organized, for the report of our international secretary is correct, I have no doubt; I have no reason to doubt it. They are organizing themselves into political organizations having the same purpose and the same goal in view that we have here in America. Japan is no better than Russia; they are already confiscating their papers; they are already persecuting their members; they are already placing them in jail. And now when that resolution is passed here, the capitalist class government and the capitalist class will find out and say that the socialists of America stand for restriction; that the man trying to escape from Japan, trying to escape from the gallows, has no place to come and find a refuge and save his life. (Applause.) It was stated that it would lower the standard of living in America. Let us see. It seems only yesterday that I came here to America. There were few millionaires then, but in the time since I came to America I see that the poor fellow that was here when I came here is a millionaire now. I have seen the standard of living lowered since I arrived in America, not because of immigration, but because of the introduction of machinery into production. (Applause.) I want to state to you, comrades, that we have a panic now. There is a division in opinion as to the cause of the panic. Some say that it is a financial affair. Some take the old orthodox theory of Karl Marx. Whichever it be, there is one thing sure, that the last panic, whether financial or not, is caused by over-pro-

duction and under-consumption. If you stop immigration you will confine your sale of goods to the American workingmen only, because according to the explanations given by those understanding the class struggle—I don't understand it; I am not a workingman; he is a workingman, he is an intellectual and understands it better. If the Orientals are forced to remain in China and Japan, the American manufacturer cannot sell his goods for so much money and he will look for a market in Japan or China, and if they only get eight cents a day there where they are at work to produce for sale in those countries, will not your standard of living be lowered anyhow, whether you restrict immigration or not, because of the fact that you have to produce so cheap that the Chinaman and the Japanese who live there will be able to buy? If he don't buy you close up your stores and factories, and you are thrown out, and if then there is a panic, don't blame immigration, but blame yourselves. (Applause.)

DEL. EDWARDS (Okla.): I am against the amendment. Comrade Chairman and comrades, it seems to me we have been overlooking the true mark a little bit, in regard to the idea of passing laws or resolutions excluding Chinese or Oriental labor from this country. Let us examine the facts for a minute and see what effect a resolution of this kind for the exclusion of the Orientals would have. In the year 1907, the exports of cotton goods from America fell off 40 per cent. Why? Because we Americans have for years been producing a surplus of cotton goods, and we have been finding our principal markets for this surplus in the countries of China and Japan. But, in the year 1907, 40 per cent of this market was lost to the American people. Why? Because the finest machinery, the finest cotton mills that American skill and ingenuity can create have been erected on the soil of China and Japan, and those two nations today can manufacture their own cotton goods, and, more than that, they can manufacture anything under the shining sun that we Americans can manufacture, and they can deliver it to us on our continent at less than one-half our present prices, and what are the capitalists going to do? They are going to shift the scene of action. They are going to manufacture their cotton goods in

China and Japan with that cheap labor, and it will come in direct competition with the American workingman, and what could all your resolutions do to oppose them, to keep those people out of this country? (Applause.) The seeming prosperity which the American people have enjoyed for the last five years was caused by the enormous sale of machinery and electrical supplies to the two nations of China and Japan. (Applause.) The finest flouring mills, the finest mills of every description, have been erected on the shores of those two nations, and they are almost in readiness for operation and are in a position to manufacture anything under the shining sun that we Americans can manufacture, and deliver it to us at less than half our present prices. And they have got enough people over there to do the manufacturing work of the world, and what good will it do us to pass resolutions excluding them, when the capitalists of the world are going to give them the jobs? (Applause.)

DEL. TUTTLE (Wis.): I speak against the amendment. I speak in favor of the exclusion of the Chinese. I want to say this: Every country can take care of its own problems far better than when there is this immigration that is brought about by the capitalists in the interest of capitalism. I want to say that the Chinese can look after their own interests in their own country where they understand their own laws, better than they can come to our shores, and beginning to learn what our laws are here. I want to say that we can take care of our own matters for that reason here better than if we go to China and have to learn their language and their laws. Therefore I am in favor of the exclusion of the Chinese and in no uncertain terms. I have been up in the north country. I have been up in the copper country and I have seen the tricks of the capitalists up there where they took one nation and pitted it against the other, until there are five or six men down there pulling out the ore, and not one of them can talk in the language of the others. How long do you think it would take to teach them the laws of this country or to teach them economics or anything of that kind. Here men get up like Comrade Lewis and tells us that a Chinese cook gets more money than an American cook.

DEL. LEWIS (Ill.): That is true.

DEL. TUTTLE: All right. Then let us make an exception for the Chinese cooks, but all the others let us keep out. That is one of the reasons that these men who are looked upon as intellectuals should be watched. That is one of them. The intellectuals are not frightened of the Chinese. So far as these refugees are concerned that are talked about by Knopfnagel—so far as these refugees are concerned, I want you to understand that the time is very close at hand when the refugee will be in a worse prison in America than he was in Russia. Don't think that capitalism will do any differently here than it does in any other country in the world. We have only to look to Idaho—the bull-pens, and Haywood, Moyer and Pettibone. Don't think, my friends, that this is the land for the refugee. Don't worry. He will be hanged, drawn and quartered, imprisoned, tortured here by the capitalist class just as well, just as safely, and he will be just as beautifully skinned as in any other part of the world. When Marx said, "Workingmen of the world unite," Marx said that in language that could be understood. He didn't say workingmen of the world rotate. Those who don't speak English, go where English is spoken. Those that can only speak English, go to foreign-speaking countries. He didn't tell them to study useless languages and laws; he said: Crystallize the workingmen of the world into an organization that will fight everywhere for the working classes. That means something to me; I know the meaning of it.

DEL. PAULITSCH (N. Y.): I am in favor of the exclusion of the Chinese. I think we have heard all these fine phrases before in regard to the brotherhood of man, and in regard to class consciousness, and the open gate for the oppressed, but I don't believe we can stand here and invite the coolie labor of China into this country in the interest of the capitalist class. It has been stated that if we do not allow Chinamen to come into this country the capitalist class will erect factories in China and Japan and their manufactures will compete with those of the American workingman. It may be true. But if you allow Chinese coolies to come in here in the sense in which the capitalist class wish to bring them in here at this

time, they will pit the Chinese and Japanese against the English-speaking races, and create race hatred and race riots, and I want to say that it is impossible to go to the American workingman, inflamed with this feeling of race hatred, and show him that it is to his interest to become a Socialist as against the appeals of those who will say it is to his interest to kill Chinamen that we have admitted into this country, and thus perpetrate this system and keep us from growing. I do not believe the time has arrived when we can do this. I am not opposed to allowing Chinese and Japanese to come in—that is, restrict them entirely. I am opposed to it, however, at this time, because I believe that this agitation going on at the present time, as we read about it and as it has taken effect in the American factory and mill, is a thing brought about by the capitalist class to embroil us in a battle of hatred between us and the Chinaman, as they do now between organized workingmen and the colored men in some of the states. It is hard to reach the intelligence of a man who is inflamed with that kind of feeling towards the Chinese.

Another point: It has been said that "it will not bring down the living conditions of the American workingmen. I want to say that we cannot compare any race that has landed on the shores of this country—even though they come from the poorest part of Russia—we cannot compare them with the coolie labor of China in any sense. I don't believe that the most ignorant man from Russia, or anywhere else—even from the Sicilian islands of Italy—can be compared to Japanese and Chinese coolie labor. There is a chance to meet those men. We all know the history of the difficulties that we have had to contend with in this line in our propaganda of the last few years, the capitalist forces pitting one class of American workingmen against others; we have had all we could do to handle these things. And I believe that the admission of the Chinese coolies without any restriction whatever would present a far greater and more difficult problem than anything we have yet had to contend with.

DEL. SPARGO (closing for the Committee on Resolutions): I want the friends in the gallery and in the rear to remember that I am not addressing them, but the delegates in this conven-

tion, and that I do not desire any expressions of opinion from anybody but the delegates to this convention.

Upon the question of this amendment, comrades, I desire to ask you this: You are asked by the mover of this amendment to commit the Socialist Party of America to a definite attitude toward a given race as a race. You are asked to take an attitude of hostility against a race as a race. That is a long, long cry from any position the Socialist Party has yet taken in this country. It may be the correct attitude. I don't know. If upon investigation it should appear that the working class interests of this country demand it, then we ought to take that attitude. I am not of those who can satisfy themselves with high-sounding phrases. "Workers of the world, unite." That did not mean that the workers of the world were to unite in the United States or in any particular country. It meant that the workers in China, the workers in India, the workers in Germany, the workers in this country, should unite against the capitalist class in its own country and unite internationally when the capitalists unite internationally. But, comrades and friends, I am prepared, if I can be convinced of the fact, that the racial differences are such that they are insurmountable, and that they must always draw race lines in this country—if I can be convinced of that fact, then I am prepared to take my stand against Asiatic immigration—but not till then.

I ask you to act as sober-minded men and women and to say: "Let us find out the facts first and then pledge the Socialist Party of America on the basis of those facts carefully ascertained, carefully discussed, carefully sifted, carefully brought before the whole membership—and not upon the basis of a passionate appeal, a prejudiced appeal on either side of this convention."

Comrades, I ask you to vote cautiously, because the interests of the American Socialist Party are at stake, and this is a fight where we want to know all the facts—

THE CHAIRMAN: Your time is up. The secretary will read the amendment.

The amendment was read.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you will adopt this amendment indicate it by say-

ing aye. Those opposed, no. The noes have it.

ASST. SEC. STRICKLAND: A telegram has been handed me by the courtesy of the United Press Association representative on the other side of the table, which I ask consent to read. (Reading):

Telluride, Colo., May 14, 1908.

Steve Adams, accused member of the Western Federation of Miners, won decided victory here today when judge granted motion of attorneys for change of venue shifting the trial from Telluride to Grand Junction, where it was admitted he could get a fair trial.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have disposed of the amendment. We are now upon the main question of the report of the committee.

DEL. FIELDMAN (N. Y.): I am opposed to the resolution for the following reasons. It is proposed in that resolution to study a question that we now thoroughly understand, and that we disagree upon simply because some think it is inexpedient to make a decided declaration or to take a decided stand upon the question. It would be a very difficult matter to find a Socialist—a thorough-going, intelligent Socialist—that has any race prejudice. It would be a difficult proposition to find anywhere a Socialist movement, not only of a state or nation, but a Socialist movement anywhere that has a race prejudice as a whole. We are practically agreed upon this question of exclusion of immigrants, no matter how they come here, whether it be by contract labor or whether they come individually of their own free will. This question reminds me of what the capitalist class have used for many years as "dope" or "bait" to catch the votes of the working class by dividing them on the question of free trade or tariff. The Socialist movement of this country constantly pointed out the fact that free trade or high tariff did not interest the working class of this country. That is pre-eminently a bourgeois proposition, and if it had been suggested that a committee be appointed for the purpose of studying that question we should have said plainly: We understand this question does not interest the working class or affect the working class, but it does affect the larger capitalists in their fights with the smaller capitalists for economic control

of the markets. We are agreed upon that point, and that is why we never put a plank on that subject in the platform; that is why we never passed a resolution on that question, that is why we never appointed committees to study the question, because we understood that as working men and working women the question did not interest us, but it did interest the capitalist class.

Comrades, I don't believe that any of you are frightened, as Socialists, by the possibility of the yellow man coming to this country; you are not frightened by the proposition that some of the comrades have made here, particularly Comrade Berger, that if they do come here—five thousand yearly—it is only a question of ten years before you will be swept off the face of this continent—

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): Five million, I said.

DEL. FIELDMAN: The world as a whole is bound to make progress. It does not make any difference to the working class as a whole how the capitalist class attacks the working class. The workers as a whole are rising and they are bound to rise. Nothing can possibly interfere with their controlling the forces of the world in the very near future. Whether the capitalist class succeeds or fails on the battlefield of high tariff or low tariff, whether they fight for exclusion or immigration unlimited, the working class, no matter where they are, are bound to rise. That capitalist system is crumbling, and I do not care whether it is the yellow workingman or the black workingman or the white workingman, or the Irish or the German or the American workingman who rule this country so long as it is the working classes that rule it. That is the main proposition. Therefore, comrades, I do not believe we ought to appoint a committee for the purpose of giving up this time to the study of this question. We are agreed that the workers of the world are equal; that there are no differences—or if there are, we ought to wipe them out and not encourage them. I hope you will not allow the deception to exist in your mind, nor will you allow the impression to be made upon the mind of the public, even for a moment, that the American workingman needs to make a study of the yellow workingman. The yellow workingman has proved himself capable of taking care of the capitalist

situation in Japan, and he will do the same in China. If he comes here we will unite with him, and they will unite with us in wiping capitalism out of existence.

DEL. COLE (Cal.): I speak for the resolution. If I did not have a special word to say that had not yet been said I would not rise. I speak for the resolution because I have that special word to say. I have two or three of them. The first special word is this: I want to notify you that the Pacific coast is not united in demanding anti-immigration laws. It is not united in the Socialist Party. It is not united in the labor field for a strong demand for anti-immigration laws. I write for a labor paper continually; I am supported by a labor paper continually; I read no anti-immigration sentiment; therefore I know that the trades union men themselves are not united in these demands for anti-immigration laws.

Now, I wish to say this—and this is a point that has not been made: I am heartily and strongly for the working class, I am of the working class, a descendant of the working class, and never expect to get out of the working class. Now, I look back over the history of the world, not of the United States alone, but of the whole world, for the last hundred years, and I see in all nations, in all lands, in all states, progress, steady progress, toward an organization of the different races, toward an amalgamation of the races.

Comrades, the Socialist Party does not leave humanity. The Socialist Party must take its lessons from humanity. You must look at human progress; keep your ear to the ground, and see which way the human race is traveling, in order to know how to act. For the last one hundred years the steady progress of the world has been toward an amalgamation of the races. You can no more stop that progress than you can sweep the Pacific ocean back with a broom. Are you going to waste your time in an effort to stop this progress? Or are you going to line up to the best of your ability in your efforts to defeat the capitalist class?

I wish to say one word about the manner of conducting the industries of China and Japan. Certain comrades have said that they have no coal or oil or iron in China. They have said that

they lack natural resources in the Orient. I tell you that is not the fact; they have those resources in the Orient; but they are simply not developed. But machinery is being taken there rapidly, as rapidly as it can be shipped from the Pacific coast, and those resources are going to be developed, and quickly, too, in the very near future. Comrades, some will say, very well, let them take their machine industries and establish their factories in the Orient; we will keep our farms. But the capitalist class are monopolizing the land. If they take the machine industries to China and Japan you cannot turn to agriculture because the capitalists are monopolizing the land. You have got to work in the factory or on the land. Now, this is the situation, and it is a serious one. It is a grave situation that we have before us, and I claim, comrades, hard as that truth is to face, that the wages of labor are bound to go down in the near future, because you will have to compete with the Oriental races either here or abroad. Therefore, comrades, your main object should be to unite all the races in one great fight against capitalism and capture the political power of the world. There is your only hope. If the capitalists can divide the workers on the race question; if they can stir up race hatred on the Pacific coast against the Japanese and the Chinese, they will make use of that race hatred to bring about war with Japan, slaughter the American and Japanese workmen, break up the Pacific coast unions, and at the end of the war you will have unlimited, unrestricted immigration, for the trusts will then have complete control of the situation. War will destroy the unions on the coast. Trades unionism cannot go forward and develop in the face of war. The Standard Oil Company wants to bring about war with Japan at this moment, because a Japanese trust has gained control of oil in California, and proposes to take it to Japan and refine it and ship it all over the world. For that reason, because the Standard Oil Company fears competition in Japan, they want to stir up the Pacific coast working class. I thank you for your attention.

DEL. HAYES (Ohio): I want to speak in opposition to the resolution.

I am opposed to postponing action on this matter for practically four years. I don't know at the present juncture a

single body of organized labor throughout the length and breadth of this land, a single body of working people who are banded together for the purpose of bettering their conditions, who are in favor of unrestricted immigration of coolie labor into the United States. I would say to you that if these coolies—whom some of these theorists, some of the comrades who do not come in contact or competition with them, are in favor of admitting—if they were Socialists or even trades unionists, then let us admit them. On the other hand, they are simply an added load on the back of the workers, another burden for the struggling men and women who are trying to better their conditions or to prevent themselves being driven into a condition of degradation and slavery.

The Stuttgart convention may have passed a resolution on this matter, that possibly, to be charitable, very few of the delegates understood. How many coolie laborers go from Japan and China into Great Britain, or into France, or into Germany, or into Switzerland, or any other of the industrial European nations? Practically none. But they come here in swarms. Thousands upon thousands sneak across the borders to come in ruinous competition with white labor, intensifying the class struggle, and to the detriment of the workers who are fighting for better conditions and expect to continue fighting. Oh, yes, Karl Marx said, "Workingmen of the world, unite." That statement I believe emanated about sixty years ago. Marx himself has been dead for twenty-five years. I believe if Marx lived in the United States, and investigated conditions on the Pacific coast, that Karl Marx would be likely to change his tactics on the question and would not advocate a plan which is so plainly and unmistakably for the advantage of the capitalist class.

DEL. HOLMAN (Tex.): A point of order. I know Comrade Hayes well. He is making a speech in favor of that resolution.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair thinks the point of order is well taken.

DEL. HAYES: I am opposed to the resolution. That resolution carries with it the postponement of this question for four years. I want immediate action here and now in favor of the exclusion of the coolies from Japan and China.

I say to you that it would be danger-

ous for the Socialist Party to go into the field in this campaign and be charged, without an opportunity to make a denial, with standing for unrestricted immigration from the Orient. You will have every workman who has carried a card, or who has struck, or who has stood up for his principles, opposing you at every turn and in every way.

Comrades, I am compelled as a worker engaged in the industrial struggle in this country, who has given consideration to and heard from men in every part of the labor movement, who come face to face with this cold, stubborn fact of oriental immigration every day of their lives, to vote against the report of the committee, or at least for its reference back in order that that part as to four years' postponement, four years' procrastination, four years of cowardice, may be stricken out and another motion substituted for it.

I want to make one more point and then I am through. Reference has been made to what is termed the international solidarity of the working class. Now, if the Chinese or the Japanese—despite the fact that there is a small nucleus of the Socialist movement in Japan or China—if they would demonstrate to the world that there is the slightest revolutionary spirit in them, if they would demonstrate it by battling against the forces that oppress them, I would be inclined to be more lenient upon this question, but it will take generations and possibly centuries before the orientals become fully aroused to their condition—

(Cries of "No, No, No.")

DEL. HAYES: You may ridicule it if you like, but you will find I am right. There is just one more point I want to make, and that is that the Socialist Party will have obtained control of the United States of America and introduced here the co-operative commonwealth before the orientals have even started in the line of modern industrialism, and when that has come to pass we can welcome them to our shores without any danger to ourselves or the progress we have made.

DEL. SPARGO (closing for the Committee on Resolutions): I want to ask you first, as Socialists, do you agree that the fundamental principle of modern Socialism is the class struggle, or do you agree that it is a Utopian idea of brotherhood which we have had for

thousands of years? If you believe in the class struggle, you cannot vote against that resolution; and I want to ask if you believe that the economic interest of the working class is to be the controlling principle with this political party of Socialism, or do you believe that some abstract ethical principle is to be the controlling force, and if you say it is to be the economic interest of the working class which is to guide the working class, then I say you cannot vote against the declaration of that principle in this resolution.

Now, then, comrades, we have decided already that we are not yet fully informed upon the racial questions involved in this matter and therefore are not prepared to vote intelligently upon it. What does my friend Hayes say—for I wish to leave all the rest unanswered, because it answers itself in the very weakness of its own statement—but what does my friend Hayes say? He asks you to believe that there is to be a panic in the country, that the working class movement is to be demoralized because we will not take immediate action at the behest of those labor unions which demand complete exclusion. But I say to him, "Friend Hayes, why hasn't it happened before?" We have never had any declaration of that sort before, and the unions have them there for twenty-five years or more, ever since Dennis Kearney occupied the "sand lots" in San Francisco. Comrades, I ask you to vote that we are a party of the working class, that it is the economic interest of the working class which must guide our party, that we leave it to the states themselves to decide if they have an Asiatic problem. They can decide it upon the basis of local state autonomy, and, above all, I ask that you recognize that the immigration problem is a big problem, a complex problem, and that therefore you proceed to the election of a Committee of Five.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is on the adoption of the report of the committee. Those in favor of the adoption of the report will make it known by saying aye; those opposed, no. The ayes have it.

DEL. HOLMAN: I wish to go on record in the minutes of this convention as voting no.

DEL. HERMAN (Wash.): Wash-

ington desires to go on record as voting no.

A DELEGATE: New Jersey demands the same right.

THE CHAIRMAN: You can make those requests to the secretary.

Nominations made for the Permanent Immigration Committee, and the election deferred until the following day in order to have the ballots printed.

On motion of Del. Hagel of Oklahoma it was decided to hold an evening session.

FREE SPEECH.

DEL. SPARGO (continuing report of Committee on Resolutions): There are two resolutions yet to be reported to this body. The first is on free speech. It is as follows:

"Capitalism, fleeing before the triumphant advance of Socialism, is trying to suppress free speech. Ignorance and intimidation are the twin forces that the ruling capitalist class relies on to hold its power in order to control and rob the working class. The police power of the state is being used forcibly to prevent the peaceable assembly of the working class to discuss their grievances and for the adoption of measures to secure its emancipation from wage slavery. Public meetings of the Socialist Party all over the country have been unlawfully and brutally broken up and the speakers arrested, fined and imprisoned without warrant of law, by officials who ignorantly believe that a policeman's uniform clothes them with autocratic power.

"We, the Socialist Party of the United States, in National Convention assembled, serve notice upon the capitalist class that we shall hold its henchmen acting as public officials responsible for their illegal acts, and we shall prosecute them in the criminal courts to the full extent of the law; also that we shall sue them in the civil courts for actual damages to compensate our comrades for the wrongs inflicted upon them."

I move the adoption of that resolution.

The motion was seconded by several delegates.

THE CHAIRMAN: Those in favor of the resolution will say aye. Those opposed, no. The resolution is carried unanimously.

THE UNITY QUESTION.

DEL. SPARGO: The next resolution is by no means a unanimous recommendation, I am sorry to say. We have a majority report and two minority reports. One report is signed by six members of the committee; the first minority report is signed by two members and the second minority report is signed by one member. The subject of the various reports is the unity of the two Socialist parties in America. With your permission I shall read the three reports and ask then that the signers of the first minority report may be represented by Comrade Kaplan, who will act as chairman of that minority, and the other minority report may be represented by Comrade Wagenknecht, who is the only man signing it, and who will take responsibility for his own report. As chairman of the majority I assume responsibility only for our own report, and upon that report we take our stand. The majority recommendation is as follows:

"Resolved, That no steps looking toward the unity of the Socialist Party and the Socialist Labor Party be taken at this time, other than to invite all members of the Socialist Labor Party who so desire to become members of the Socialist Party."

(Signed) BENJAMIN F WILSON.

ED. MOORE.

H. R. KEARNS.

C. C. ROSS.

ELIZABETH H. THOMAS.

JOHN SPARGO.

The first and second minority reports I will read merely that you may have all the reports in their proper sequence, but the defense of these latter two reports rest upon the shoulders of Comrade Kaplan in one case and Comrade Wagenknecht in the other.

FIRST MINORITY REPORT ON UNITY QUESTION.

"Whereas, The National Executive Committee of the Socialist Labor Party has requested the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party to arrange for a conference upon the question of the unity of the two parties; and

"Whereas, We believe that we are representing the sentiments of our constituents in the matter in expressing our gratification at this attitude on the part

of our S. L. P. comrades, we instruct the National Secretary of the Socialist Party to send a reply to the Socialist Labor Party invitation to the following effect:

"First: We are in favor of the unity of the two parties, provided that we are not called upon to surrender any fundamental principles of the party as expressed in the official decision of this convention.

"Second: We are just entering upon the most momentous and critical campaign in our history, and our supreme interest at the present time and for some months to come is the political fight against capitalism, and we cannot undertake to devote our time and energies to the discussion of possible terms of unity in our locals and in our press. We cannot afford to have our best and most active workers occupied with this question during the coming months. We are therefore both unwilling and unable to enter now into such a conference.

"Third: In view of these facts, we think it wise not to enter upon any negotiations between the two national organizations at this time, but we hold that the details and the time of arriving at unity, if thought desirable in any state, shall be left to the Socialists of that state.

"Fourth: It is the sense of this convention that in the event that the Socialist Labor Party refrains from putting a presidential ticket in the field, the situation should not be so interpreted as to forbid the Socialist Party in any state from uniting with the Socialist Labor Party on state and local ticket."

(Signed) M. KAPLAN.

C. H. KERR.

Minority report No. 2 reads as follows. It is signed by Comrade Wagenknecht of Washington:

SECOND MINORITY REPORT ON UNITY QUESTION.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT: It is the same with the exception of clauses three and four.

DEL. SPARGO: I shall be very pleased to omit reading the first part. Comrade Wagenknecht proposes to change the last two clauses of the first minority report to read as follows:

"It is therefore our decision that nominations for a Committee of Seven

members to represent the Socialist Party as proposed by the Socialist Labor Party be made during the month of January, 1909, and that a conference be held as soon thereafter as can be arranged."

Comrade Wagenknecht then proposes to leave out entirely the clause which provides for a possible unity in the states rather than a national combination.

DEBATE ON UNITY QUESTION.

DEL SPARGO: Comrades, on behalf of the committee, I move the adoption of the majority report, that no steps looking toward the unity of our party with the Socialist Labor Party be taken at this time, other than to invite all the members of the Socialist Labor Party who so desire to become members of the Socialist Party.

SEVERAL DELGATES: Second the motion.

DEL. KAPLAN (Minn.): On behalf of the minority I offer as a substitute the minority report signed by Comrade Kerr and myself.

The motion was duly seconded.

DEL. KAPLAN: I may say that I did not expect that this resolution submitted by the minority, judging by the sentiment manifested by the delegates on the floor, will carry. But you also know, comrades, that although I am a Duluth man today, for the past four or five years that I was living here, I have been on the minority side before. I am on the minority side today because I believe that there is an important principle involved in this proposition. Here we are confronted with a situation where another Socialist Party, through its National Executive Committee, passes a resolution showing a desire for unity of all the Socialist forces, for a unity of their and our political parties. It is true that the S. L. P. is a smaller organization. It is true that we are continually increasing the membership. But my contention is this, that unless it can be demonstrated—I don't believe that it can—that the S. L. P. is not a Socialist party—unless that can be demonstrated, and I say it cannot be demonstrated, that the S. L. P. does not stand for the principles of Socialism fundamentally, then I contend that we ought not to put on one side in a slurring way this request of theirs. My contention is this, and I am speaking as an ex-member of the So-

cialist Labor Party—I was a member of the national convention that took place at Rochester, the first convention of the S. L. P.—speaking as a man who was one of the participants in the events that transpired away back in 1899, my contention is that the differences between us are matters of tactics, that they are personal differences; my contention is that the comrades of the Socialist Labor Party—and don't forget that when I mention them that I apply the same to ourselves—that the tactics that they have pursued of going out and knocking every fellow, the tactics of going out and calling other men names, were the tactics that put them in the position they occupy at the present time. But, comrades, men are fallible. No one of us is infallible. I contend that the very fact that these comrades have initiated through their national committee this request for a conference is evidence, in my opinion, at least, that they have realized their mistake, that they have realized that their tactics are not the kind of tactics that can develop a healthy Socialist movement, and I also contend—if you pass the report of the majority, and I have not gone into details, yet, because I want to leave that for the close—I contend if you pass this resolution of the majority you will revive the S. L. P., and I will tell you why. You have never yet found, or at least I don't know of any state, I don't know of any political or any other movement, that was killed by mere hatred. If the Socialist Labor Party is sound fundamentally in its principles, you cannot kill them by turning around and saying, "You have called us a liar; you are another." I contend that the only way you can kill the Socialist Labor Party is by kindness; the only way you can unite the political Socialist movement of the county—I have not come to the Stuttgart resolution yet, or rather the Amsterdam resolution yet—is by going out and showing the world, showing the United States, that while we are calling upon the workers of the world to unite, we are not ourselves in a condition of disorganization, not merely between one political party and another, but also among ourselves, for the same spirit has developed among us—

THE CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.

DEL. KAPLAN: In conclusion, I contend that the same spirit with which

we have been attacking one another on the outside has now developed among ourselves on the inside. When I went to the city of Duluth I found the S. L. P. there. I spoke on the street corner, and after making my remarks there was just one question, and that question was, "What is the difference between the S. L. P. and the S. P.?" That didn't insult me. That very man is working today and hand in hand with us. Not in our movement, but he speaks upon our platform and he speaks upon their platform. We work together, and when the crucial moment arrived when it was necessary for the workers of the country to work together for the purpose of helping the Western Federation of Miners, the Moyer-Haywood Conference was participated in by both the Socialist Party and the Socialist Labor Party.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT (Wash.) (reading second minority report): I wish to move that this report be accepted by the convention.

DEL. STIRTON (Mich.): I second Comrade Wagenknecht's motion.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT: The difference between the second minority report and the first minority report is great; the difference between the two minority reports and the majority report is greater. The majority report is against unity. The two minority reports are for unity. My only effort now shall be to distinguish the differences between the two minority reports.

We all know that the question of unity is being agitated in the Socialist Party, not only by our own press, but also by the Socialist Labor Party from the outside. Now, one thing we should consider is this: Shall we have our present campaign infringed upon, or

made a side issue, by having a discussion of this question of unity during the campaign? I say no. I say this question of unity should not be discussed during the campaign, either as a national issue or state issue, either between the two national committees or as a state issue between the state organization of both parties, or as a local issue between the local organizations of both parties. I say the question of unity should be left until after the national campaign, after the campaign in the states and locally, and for that reason I submit this minority report.

Comrade Kaplan's report is based upon the fact that in two states of this great Union the S. L. P. is working in harmony with the S. P. Now, I say we cannot afford to make rules for exceptions. No well-balanced body will ever take an exception and base a rule upon the exception. I claim that Comrade Kaplan has tried to give us a rule for the whole which is only applicable to exceptions. We cannot help it that the S. L. P. works in harmony with the Socialist Party in two states, Michigan and Minnesota. We know they do not work in harmony in the rest of the states. The fact that they do not work in harmony in the rest of the states means that if this question is brought into the states, namely, the question of unity, then these states' contentions will be distributed throughout the national campaign, and instead of having a good Socialist Party campaign we will have a campaign which is more or less weakened by the discussion of this matter. Therefore I offer my report.

THE CHAIRMAN: The time has come for adjournment.

Adjourned until 7:30 p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

Chairman Clark called the convention to order at 7:30.

THE CHAIRMAN: In your efforts to get a hearing this evening I want you to confine yourselves to the table of the delegation that you are with, and keep away from those other tables. That is the way I am going to take you when you want to get the floor.

DEBATE ON UNITY QUESTION CONTINUED.

DEL. CARR (Ill.): I understand that the business before us is the matter that we were discussing before the adjournment. I move the previous question.

DEL. STRICKLAND: I second it, understanding that there are twelve speeches to be made. (Carried.)

DEL. HANFORD (N. Y.): I wish to oppose the minority report of Comrade Wagenknecht and to favor the majority report of the committee. Comrades, I regret that in five minutes I cannot go into this subject in a way to do it justice. I do not speak here at this time for the sake of changing any votes. I have no doubt you have your opinions made up, but I believe it will be in order if a few important facts regarding the so-called Socialist Labor Party are placed in the records of this convention. This is all the more important because many of the more recent members of our party are not familiar with the history of the S. L. P.

I want to say, first, that the reason I am opposed to the minority report of the comrade from Washington is that I do not recognize that the so-called Socialist Labor Party is a Socialist party. (Applause, and a voice, "Good.") I do not recognize that it is a labor party, and I do not recognize that it is a political party. (Applause.) The so-called Socialist Labor Party is a scab labor party. The so-called Socialist Labor Party is a labor union faking party. Now, I want to get in the record one thing: I just want to prove that it is a scab labor party by its own evidence.

Back in 1900 there was a strike of the cigarmakers employed in the Davis factory in New York City. The New York Labor News Company, controlled by the Socialist Labor Party, in December, 1900, published a pamphlet entitled "The Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance vs. the 'Pure and Simple' Trade Union." That pamphlet was the stenographic report of a debate between Daniel DeLeon and Job Harriman. It was prepared by Benj. F. Keinard, then a member of the Socialist Labor Party. In that debate it was shown by Job Harriman, and it was not disputed by DeLeon, that the strike of the cigarmakers in the Davis shop was AGAINST A REDUCTION IN WAGES. In his own report of that debate on page 42 of the pamphlet to which I have referred, DeLeon himself declared that when the officers of the International Cigarmakers' Union called the men working in the Davis shop on strike, "many of them went out." These are DeLeon's own words. Then this man who is leader of the S. L. P.—I might almost say he is the S. L. P.—justified the action of the Socialist

Labor Party's fake trade union, the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance, in filling the places of the men who went out on strike in the Davis shop by declaring that the shop was only partly manned by union men, that therefore it was not a union shop, and that therefore it was all right for S. T. & L. A. members to take the places of the strikers. In an issue of The People in May, 1906, in the department under the heading of "Letter Box," the editor of The People, after stating that the members of the International Cigarmakers' Union were on strike in the Davis shop says: "The rest of the shop was then organized by the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance and the vacancies filled."

When you remember that De Leon has for long years been the leader of the S. L. P., and when you remember that the pamphlet from which I have quoted is an S. L. P. publication, and that The People from which I have quoted is the official organ of the S. L. P. and that DeLeon is its editor, you will understand what I meant when I said that I wished to prove by its own evidence that the Socialist Labor Party is a Scab Labor Party.

In the words of the editor of the Daily People, it was all right when men went on strike in a certain International Cigarmakers' Union, it was all right then, because the "fakers" ordered a strike, for the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance to organize the shop and fill the vacancies. I want to say that any man who calls himself a Socialist and proposes to take the place of any man that is on strike on a question of wages, I care not whether he be a union man, an anti-union man, a non-union man, or a scab—I say the man that would scab on a scab does not deserve the name Socialist. (Great applause.) I say further, that we want no communication with these men. I say that I honestly believe that the only purpose of the resolution passed by the Executive Committee of the S. L. P. was to get a wedge into the Socialist party for the sake of splitting this party. (Applause.) The tactics of the Socialist Labor Party have not changed, and such being the case, if leaders were honest they could not and would not ask for unity with the Socialist Party. I am fully justified in believing that they do not look for

unity with us in good faith or for any good purpose.

Read the record of the S. L. P., and what do you find? You find, first, that it split the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance in 1898. You find, second, that it split the Socialist Labor Party in 1899. You find, third, that less than two years ago it split the I. W. W. (Applause.) Is there anything, is there any organization of labor that the S. L. P. methods and the S. L. P. commanders have ever been into that they have not split? And shall we let them into our organization that the Socialist Party may be split also? (A voice, "No.") We cannot afford to have anything to do with them at any time.

If any member of the S. L. P., finding out that party is a party of disorganization, disruption and death to the labor movement, wants to join our party, well and good. But I want nothing to do with Bill Sykes, the burglar; I want nothing to do and I want no communication with Jesse James, the train robber; I want nothing to do with Daniel DeLeon, the union wrecker, and Farley, the strike breaker, and men that are known as the enemies of the labor movement by every man in the United States who is devoted to that movement at all. For years the S. L. P. workers did just one thing; they followed around all our speakers everywhere—to do what? To do what? To enlighten the people on the subject of socialism? No, indeed, but to discredit our speakers; not that they wanted to talk socialism, but they wanted our speakers to be unable to talk socialism. They did their best to destroy our party. Now, shall we take the serpent to our bosom and warm him so that he can disrupt this party as he has tried to do with everything else? I say no, and no, and no. (Applause.)

DEL. SNYDER (Kan.): I only want to talk just a minute, to say that I read a letter, about a week before I left Girard, written to Eugene V. Debs, that Frank Bohn, National Secretary of the S. L. P., had quit the party and has offered to become a member of the Socialist party of the United States if they would take him in (applause), and that he recommended in that letter that the Socialist party pay no attention to the request for unity with Daniel DeLeon. (Applause.)

DEL. BAUER (Cal.): It is a very

poor specimen of a human being who won't stand up for what he believes to be true and right, although the majority may be against him. Now, I am going to let the older heads blow off their steam and indulge in personalities, if they please to do so, but I prefer to consume the five minutes allotted to me in dealing with the fundamental question involved. The question, in my opinion, is this, gentlemen and comrades: Are we going to assume the attitude of the Employers' Association toward the labor unions, and say to this that we call a skeleton organization, that pretends to represent the Socialist movement in this country, "We have nothing to arbitrate," or are we going to understand things? That is all. Now, I care but little for your opinion of me. I have worked loyally for seven years in the Socialist party, but I am proud to say that I have also been a member of the Socialist Labor Party for seven years previous to that time (applause), young though I may be, and I can but say that I have the utmost gratitude in my heart for the education that the Socialist Labor Party has given me. (Applause.)

Now, let me tell you, cut out all your personalities. I don't care a pin in hell what Daniel DeLeon may be or what Victor Berger may be, or what Comrade Hanford may be. But, I want to say this, comrades, that in a struggle between organizations just as in a struggle between individuals, there is a struggle for life, and the new organization, the Socialist party, has defeated the old mother organization in the struggle for existence. During that struggle, bitterness, strife and acrimonious discussions were bound to arise. If Jesus Christ himself, the lowly Nazarene, had represented one side, the condition for strife was there and strife it would have been. Now, then, we have grown, we have developed, we are strong. It is true, here is the skeleton, the remnant of that old guard left. Cut out DeLeon, but I say we have got our DeLeons in our own party. (Applause.) I speak from personal experience when I say that there are locals in the state of California, when I say that there are loyal socialists throughout this United States who have stayed out of the Socialist Party and out of the Socialist Labor Party. Why? They were disgusted with the Socialists of both sides. Now,

the reason why a few men stood by the old organizations, although they did not always agree with DeLeon, or the fact that the S. L. P. endorsed the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance, is due to the fact that so few men have in them the quality that most of us lack, the quality of constancy. That is a quality that we should rather admire than shrink from. I admire the man who is not so fickle that he can change his political affiliations at every chance. Some other Socialist party may develop and offer promises greater than before, and these men who have so readily left the old S. L. P. will just as readily leave your party. Now, I do not say that we are to let the S. L. P., the skeleton, our parent organization, lay down the terms upon which we will unite with it. No, I do not care how you arrange this conference, but I do assert this, that if you assume the intolerant position that you charge the S. L. P. with, you, gentlemen and comrades and ladies, you have to lose and the S. L. P. will gain. That is what I claim. (Manifestations of disapproval.) When my time is up I will yield the floor to you.

You say, "Workingmen of all countries, unite," but you are not big-hearted enough, great hearted enough to divest yourselves of the selfishness that you charge to the other side. (Applause.) You are the strongest. You can lay down your own terms. But, is it generous, is it great in the victor to say, "Now I have whipped you, I am going to walk on you for a few hours, or a few days, or a few months?" There is nothing generous, nothing noble about that. For the ten, fifty, or a hundred honest men that may be left of that grand old skeleton, for the sake of those I assume it is our duty, in the interest of workingmen's organizations and socialist harmony, to submit to a conference. (Applause.)

DEL. LOCKWOOD (Mich.): I wish to say for the benefit of Comrade Ben Hanford and others that I have been in the movement sixteen years, and I do not want to be classed with those that came in recently. I know what I am talking about. I wish to say that on July 4, three years ago this coming July, the state of Michigan in its convention passed a resolution in favor of unity, and I am proud of the state for doing it. (Applause.) I want to say further,

that on July 4th, the following year, that resolution was again passed, having been submitted to a referendum and passed unanimously by the state in the meantime, and was again referred to a referendum and passed. I want to say further that the state of Michigan today, with but two exceptions, one local in Detroit, the smallest local in the city, and Local Cliff—and I make these exceptions for the benefit of the locals—I want to say that the entire state of Michigan, as far as I am able to learn, and I have been State Secretary for two years, is for unity. (Applause.) Why? Because of the fact that the Socialist movement demands that all forces that make for revolution get together, and we recognize, no matter what you say to the contrary, these old comrades in the S. L. P., and I am willing to admit that they have their faults; I am one who has suffered from their abuse and all that; but nevertheless I call your attention to this fact, that you can look around this convention and you will find the leading men among the best of you have come from where? From the old S. L. P. (Applause.) I want to say, in spite of the fact that there may be leaders in that organization who have done wrong, that the rank and file of the S. L. P. are clear-cut revolutionary socialists (applause), and we need them in our movement. Now, I do not know that this proposition has been submitted properly and the committees have been given a chance to act. I do not know, when the report is in, that I will vote favorably, but I say I have a right, and that our party in Michigan has a right, to know on what ground the Socialist Labor Party proposes to unite with us, and to know whether there is not some chance of getting together and not turning them down before a trial. (Applause.) I have been, fortunately or unfortunately, in my experience in the Socialist movement, up against the capitalist courts, and you know that when a Socialist goes up against the capitalist courts, if he gets a trial it is a poor one. He is judged before he comes up, and the Socialist party, our party, has judged and tried them without a hearing.

(Applause and cries of "No.")

I am in the minority. Granting that I am, I have been in the minority for sixteen long years in the Socialist revo-

lution, and may be in the minority in this body if necessary, standing for the principle of unity, uniting our forces for socialism. I claim that these old revolutionary socialists in the S. L. P. organization, made up of the material out of which revolutionists are made, have been, of course, the result of their environment and their struggle, in spite of all their mistakes. I do not want to play the part of a bully because our movement has grown larger than theirs. I think it is time for us to be a little generous. I think it is our business to recognize the principles that we advocate, the principles of brotherhood. Where are our principles of the brotherhood of man here, when we refuse even to confer with a body of Socialists? Where do we stand by our principles that we say we should get together? The Stuttgart resolution, as I understand, demanded that the Socialist parties of the different countries unite their forces against the common enemy. What are we doing toward uniting? I stand, and I think my state is behind me, for at least a conference, and I believe after the conference has been held, then we perhaps may change our mind, but as I see it today I shall stand for unity even after that, although without any compromise of principle. This is not a question of compromise of principle. It is a question, in my judgment, of the bitterness engendered by the different fights in which these comrades have been, the personal feelings taking possession of them to the exclusion of the good of the movement; and I am sorry, indeed, that we cannot enter the next campaign with a united force against the common enemy. Instead of that, we have still a division. I shall stand by our party.

DEL. SCHWARTZ (Pa.): Is it not a fact that when the Socialist party of Michigan offered to unite with the S. L. P., the S. L. P. turned them down?

DEL. LOCKWOOD: No, not to my knowledge.

THE CHAIRMAN: The comrade who introduced the minority report will have five minutes to conclude the argument.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT (Wash.): I have not belonged to the party sixteen years. I have only been a member of the Socialist party for five years. It took me about three years to decide whether to join the Socialist Labor

Party or the Socialist party. (Applause.) Now it is taking other comrades in the United States just a little time to decide whether they shall join the Socialist Labor Party or the Socialist party.

There is just one reason why this minority report should be the report of the committee rather than the other minority report, and I wish to state that reason. The minority report before the house keeps the unity wrangle out of the states, out of the party, until after the national campaign. The other minority report will place the unity wrangle inside of the state organizations before the national campaign, and that is the difference. All those of you who believe that this matter should not come up until after the national campaign, I ask you to vote for the report now before the house. Now, Comrade Bohn and Comrade DeLeon are not together. Comrade DeLeon fired Comrade Bohn. (Applause and laughter.)

A DELEGATE: He will fire you yet.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT: Then why should not Comrade Bohn say to Comrade Debs, "Don't advocate unity with the S. L. P.?" Why, of course not, not from Comrade Bohn's point of view. Some comrades have said that all that Comrade DeLeon or the S. L. P. is trying to do is to get a wedge into the Socialist party to disrupt the Socialist party. Well, the Socialist party is just a little too large to be disrupted by the Socialist Labor Party.

A DELEGATE: How about Mills?

MR. WAGENKNECHT: Mills didn't disrupt the Socialist party of Washington. He tried to, but he found out that all he did was to disrupt himself. If the Socialist Labor Party has set a trap to trap the Socialist party, let me say one thing, that the Socialist Labor Party trap is just a little too small to trap the Socialist party.

Why are you against a unity conference in January, 1909? By advocating a unity conference, it does not mean that we unite. Certainly, if our different committees come together and our committees find out that the Socialist Labor Party is not in existence, how can unity be effected? If our committee and the committee of the Socialist Labor Party meet, and our committee says to the Socialist Labor Party, "Let us see your

membership roll," if they can produce nothing, what are we going to unite? Again, if our committee finds out that the Socialist Labor Party is a party based upon utopian principles, as Comrade Spargo says, and Comrade Hanford has said—

DEL. HANFORD: No, no.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT: He says the Socialist Labor Party is a scab party. If we find it is a scab party, why unite? Because you say you are going to have a conference does not mean that you are going to unite. There are just two reasons, practical ones, why we should have a unity conference. One is to take out of our own party the wrangle which will ensue if we do not propose a conference, and to take out of the hands of the S. L. P. the argument that we, the Socialist party of America, keep the Socialist party of America divided. (Applause.) Any man who has been present on the floor of this convention since its inception knows that there is just a little brains in the Socialist party, and that Daniel DeLeon has not a monopoly upon the Socialist brains of the United States. Anybody on the floor of this convention who is afraid of Daniel DeLeon—well, I am kind of ashamed of that Socialist. I have never seen a Socialist yet that I was afraid of, and no man's cause will prosper in the Socialist party, let me tell you, no man's cause will prosper in the Socialist party if that man is afraid of any man in the Socialist party—Daniel DeLeon, Mills, and some others included. I thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved to adopt the second minority report. Will you have it read to you again?

DELEGATES: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you adopt the second minority report, say aye. Contrary, no. The noes have it.

ASST. SEC. STRICKLAND then read the first minority report.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS (Ill.): I do not think there is anyone in this room that will accuse me of any particular friendship for the Socialist Labor Party organization. I recognize very much of the truth and strength of all that Comrade Hanford has said, and could add to that another tale perhaps even longer. With their national organization I believe we ought to have nothing to do. I told Comrade Kaplan this morning that if we were forced or driven into

any sort of unity with their national organization, that there was not room enough for me in the same party with the bunch that control it.

A DELEGATE: Oregon, too.

DEL. SIMONS: But I say this, that in Illinois we do not want them. I do not know what you want in other states.

A DELEGATE: We don't want them.

DEL. SIMONS: All right. But there are some states in this union where the position seems to be different. I care not how hard this S. L. P. fought the national organization in the past, but I say that I do not want to see any portion of the Socialist party of America slapped in the face. The comrade from the state of Michigan and the comrade from Minnesota seem to think that they want to unite with the S. L. P. in those states. I believe that it is no more than fair that we give them a chance to decide that question there, if they wish and how they wish, and that is the only thing that I say supports this. (Applause.) But if those states—and they seem to know—if the rank and file of the Socialist Labor Party in those states is made up of men and women that the Socialist party members in those states want in their organization, the Socialist party members in those states are the best ones to judge. If they decide that they want them, I say to you that we have no right to put an obstacle in the road of their successful campaign. (Applause.)

We do not have to have them where we do not want them, and we do have to have them where we do. It is in our hands. We hold the majority in every state. We can do exactly as we please on that question. I do not believe it will disrupt a state. There will be no unity conference in Illinois to tear us up here. I do not hear any of it in Wisconsin. But if there are other states, as in the state of Washington, as this comrade says, where they can work with the Socialist Labor Party members there, then I say, give them a chance. That is the thing I believe in. We believe in state autonomy. It is in our constitution from beginning to end. We are but simply applying that principle here. I do not think it is of such tremendous importance. We are taking into the local in the city of Chicago more mem-

bers every six months than the Socialist Labor Party has in the entire United States. We do not need to worry very much about the thing, but it is simply to avoid trouble to them. It seems to be a thing that we have to settle, and settle along this way. And so, for the sake of the comrades in the Socialist party in those states, I shall cast my vote for this minority report and ask you to vote in the same way, if you think it advisable.

DEL. WILLIAMS (Minn.): A question of personal privilege. A false impression has been conveyed that Minnesota wants the S. L. P. Now, I want to say as a delegate from Minnesota—

THE CHAIRMAN: That is not a question of personal privilege.

DEL. C. L. FURMAN (N. Y.): You might just as well try to unite DeLeonism with our movement as to try and mix oil and water. Oil and water can be mixed in only one way, and that is to mix it with lye, and we don't want any of that thing.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): Too much lye will make too many liars.

DEL. FURMAN: Now, I speak as one in a position to speak from my own membership in the S. L. P., for I joined it in February, 1893. I sat on the National Executive Committee of the S. L. P. for four straight years, and for two years on the State Committee of the S. L. P. and all through that time the solid members of the State Committee and the S. L. P. National Executive Committee, except the trinity of DeLeon, Kuhn and Vogt, tried to get rid of DeLeon, and we could not. We could not get rid of him any more than you can get rid of the bite of a rattlesnake. The poison is there. If I see something sticking out from under a plank, with the fangs of a rattlesnake sticking out from one side and the tail of a rattlesnake sticking out from the other side, I know pretty sure there is a rattlesnake under there.

There is another thing that I want to refer to. It has been said that it will be all right to consider this thing next January. I will tell you why next January has been set. Behind this pretense of wanting unity through the membership of the rank and file of the S. L. P., there is an intrigue away back; it goes away back to the national party of the S. L. P. Their henchmen come around

on the outside and engineer in a manner similar to Pinkerton style, and these fellows work on the outside so you think it is the rank and file, but it comes from that thing under the plank. (Applause.)

Now, then, why set the first of January, 1909? Their paper is printed by an organization that is under the control of the New York police. They have a contract that expires on the first of January, 1909. They got into possession of that publishing association through debts, and when the time comes it is either death or unity. I have been all through it, I have seen disruption and disorganization. If you follow the slimy control of DeLeon and the trinity of the S. L. P. you will find split, disruption, disorganization, disgruntled members. It is not unity at all; it is disorganization.

I see down in the New York City delegation every man on the list—I don't know as there are more than one or two there but what are old S. L. P. men. Here is a comparison. Every man on it, nearly, is a stumpspeaker, a soapbox orator. Every man, if unity is consummated with the S. L. P., of that delegation—and it is a fair representation of all the working element in New York City—will go out the very moment they get official notice that the S. L. P. organization has joined the S. P.

DEL. HILLQUIT: No, no.

Other DELEGATES: No.

DEL. FURMAN: I am not making boasts or anything of the kind, but I know the spirit of the men that went out of the S. L. P. at the time of the split, and you cannot hold them in there. Go around and talk with them. I come from Brooklyn, the home of the strongest part of the organization anywhere in the country, and of the S. L. P. in New York state. The speakers, the agitators and the old German comrades in New York state—you couldn't hold them in there with chains big enough to hold a steer. They would not stay. It is not unity. Now, it has been a question at the international congress. You cannot find, any place where the international congress advocates DeLeonism. It is only a pretense, you know. I would like to speak on the tactics of the thing if I had time.

DEL. STRICKLAND (Ind.): A point of information. If you let me

get this information it will enlighten the convention. A matter came up at the Indiana state convention, and I am the Rev. F. G. Strickland who has been "exposed" by the Weekly People once more, and in that convention we asked them, since they requested of us to take state action on unity, what they would do if we did pass it, and they said they could not take any corresponding action for they were organized without state autonomy, but as one solidified organization, and could not unite with us as a state. If that be true, why does Comrade Simons and why do the other comrades advocate it? I want the information from Kaplan or Simons.

DEL. HILLQUIT (N. Y.): I want to say, comrades, I have not spoken today, and I think I have contained myself pretty well, and expect to keep within the five minutes anyhow. I am also from New York. I have also been in the S. L. P. about twelve years before the formation of the present party. I will not walk out of the Socialist party if you decide in favor of unity. (Applause.) I have no doubt whatsoever my good Comrade Furman just made a slip of the tongue; he did not mean it. He will not walk out of the party if we unite, and no member of the New York delegation will, no matter what the majority conclude. (Applause.)

I am in favor of the first minority report because I think it more expedient at this time in view of the approaching campaign than the second minority report; but I am in favor of it not only for the grounds mentioned by Comrade Simons, but also because I hold that through local co-operation, eventual unity, or rather merger, of the Socialist Labor Party in the Socialist party, will take place; and I am in favor of such a merger. (Applause.)

Now, comrades, let me tell you that if there is any man on the floor of this convention who has personal justification for bitterness against the S. L. P., it is no one more than your humble servant.

A DELEGATE: That is right.

DEL. HILLQUIT: And if there is any man in the Socialist party who has been so absolutely unjustly and maliciously abused by DeLeon, then I would like to see him.

A DELEGATE: That is right.

DEL. HILLQUIT: But I say at the same time that is not the question be-

fore us. We are not trying to square up the old accounts. (Applause.) I say also to you, I make myself no illusion about the matter; I know the Socialist Labor Party hardly represents anything to add strength and influence. I know they come to us as a last resort because they face annihilation as a party. I am not deceived, comrades, and with all that, I say, as a matter of correct Socialist tactics and expediency, considering everything, it is well ultimately to unite with whatever remains of the party (applause), and I will tell you why, and I will be brief; I have only five minutes.

I say in the first place, there is a certain charm in unity which always redounds to the benefit of the movement. I know today of thousands of workingmen, especially of the foreigners, who do not know our issues. The German Socialist Federation, the Polish Socialist Society, the Lettish Socialist Society and others do not join the organized Socialist movement in this country, because they cannot decide between the two parties intelligently. (Applause.) I know of a number of individuals who say, because they do not know any better, "I will not join the movement as long as you are divided between yourselves," and I say, that for those outside Socialists, unity will mean a good deal.

I say more. I recognize that the Socialist Labor Party, or its leading element, has been, as Comrade Hanford says, anti-socialistic in its tactics and methods. That is one reason why we, the vast majority of organized Socialists, want to have this small crowd of erring brethren among us so that we can control the tactics. (Applause.) Let me tell you something. The Socialist Labor Party today assembled in national convention, representing 500 men, adopt some ridiculous resolutions against the trade unions. We suffer. The trade unions do not make a fine distinction between our party and theirs, and they say, "The Socialists have taken this and that stand; here it is in black and white," and you go and explain to them that it is a different proposition. I hold, as our German comrades have found out, that where there are differences in the ranks of Socialism, one united party can much better bring forth the expression of the sane majority of the party than a divided party can. Furthermore, after

all, why has that argument been heard? Will anybody contend that there is contamination in the name S. L. P., and that every member who belongs there must of necessity be a scab? No. I will say to you in all frankness, when our passion and heat leaves us, when we consider calmly, that with the exception of a sole, single individual, the rank and file of the S. L. P. is as devoted as our party membership. (Applause.)

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): I am going to speak against the motion. My friend from Washington may laugh, but there is one thing sure, after every convention that Goebel goes to they don't have to guess as to what side of any question Goebel is on. He at least is no trimmer and no dodger.

Comrade Chairman and comrades, I come from New Jersey, and I come under instructions to fight every proposition looking to unity in this convention. (Applause.) Why do I come here fighting "unity"? Because we want unity, and we have discovered by experiment, actual experiment, that you don't get harmony by putting two roosters in the same cage. (Laughter.) Now, we have a proposition that means what? It says that we shall allow the states to take up this question if they see fit. Comrade Strickland has told you something that you want to remember before you pass that resolution. You have already been told they have got no state autonomy. If that is the case, why should we debate five seconds about a plan that involves state autonomy? In my state they came in the name of peace and brotherhood and unity, and they said, "Let us confer." We conferred, and as a result of the conference we had on our hands one of the biggest scraps that we have had in all our history. (Applause.) We are not sorry we have had the scrap, because, after all, comrades, we learned something that we did not know before, and that was the reason for the existence of two Socialist parties. We had the Socialist Labor Party. Presently you hear of the Social Democratic Party. Did it spring into life because any man in his wisdom wanted it? No, because there were essential differences as to tactics. I speak as a man that was never in the Socialist Labor Party. I have no bitterness and no hatred. I pride myself on never having said a harsh word against Daniel DeLeon or the S. L. P.

I have said the Socialist Party and Socialist Labor Party fight two fights against capitalism; and while I recognize that there were some here who did not know that there were differences and regarded the organizations as two separate parties, those differences still continue. What are they, briefly? We disagreed on our trade union policy. Have we of the Socialist Party changed as to our attitude on the trade union policy in favor of that of the Socialist Labor Party?

A DELEGATE: Yes.

DEL. GOEBEL: I maintain no. We differed on the matter of private ownership of the party press. Have we essentially changed on that proposition?

A DELEGATE: Yes.

DEL. GOEBEL: I maintain no. We differed again as to whether we would have a closely centralized plan of organization or state autonomy, as far as consistent with Socialist principles, giving every state freedom to work out its own individual initiative. Have we changed our attitude on that? No, because we have state autonomy in this constitution and have added to our ranks in Washington and many states that used to oppose it.

On all these three points we stand where we used to stand. If that is the case, I maintain that all those that are in the Socialist Labor Party have got to do is to say whether they believe in the kind of tactics that we believe in. If they do, let them sign an application card. If they are not willing to sign that card, if they want us to go out with waving banners and a brass band to meet them, it means after all that while they talk about not humiliating us, they want us to humiliate ourselves by getting on our stomachs and begging them to join our party. (Applause.)

This is my word to you: We are right or we are wrong in our tactics. I maintain that every day, every week, every month since these differences in the two parties came into existence has proven the wisdom of our tactics. They have gone down. Why? You don't dare to say that it is because of lack of self-sacrifice and of zeal on their part. They have even more self-sacrifice than we have in the Socialist Party. Why is it that they have gone down? Simply because their tactics and methods were

not adapted to the needs of American Socialism.

Why have we gone up? Why have we developed strength and power? Why have we got the ear of the trade unions? Why has our party press developed and our party membership grown? Because our tactics have been right; that is the reason. And if they have been right and we have grown under them, in the name of God and common sense why should we change those tactics? (Here the gavel fell.)

So I say, boys, with no hard feelings, if you want to come in, come in, but we are not losing sleep trying to drag you in. (Applause.)

DEL. KAPLAN (Minn.): The last speaker, Del. Goebel, has given us an argument in the name of God. All right, that is a sufficient reason. Another one against unity was a comrade by the name of Snyder, who accused the other fellows of actually being personal against DeLeon, but we are not personal. Del. Hanford is against unity, against the S. L. P. as a scab organization.

A DELEGATE: That is right.

DEL. KAPLAN: Wait a moment. Comrades, I do not believe I have been personal at any time upon this floor, and yet Comrade Hanford himself told me it was a shame and disgrace to Minnesota to send a man like me to this convention, because I stand for this. He is not personal, you know.

DEL. HANFORD: I did not say it in the convention. I said it to you personally.

DEL. KAPLAN: You stated it to me privately.

DEL. HANFORD: Yes, and meant it.

DEL. KAPLAN: You said it privately; that is the same thing. Comrade Spargo is against unity. He is not prejudiced. You saw it yesterday morning. He is going to convince you, as he has the last word, you know, after me. That is, he will try. I mention him because I am not personal. Untermann is against unity because he is a proletarian scientist, you know that.

Comrades, the question is, as I said at the outset, "Is the Socialist Labor Party a Socialist party?"

DELEGATES: No.

DEL. KAPLAN: If it is not, why are they permitted a seat on the floor of the International Congress? (Applause.) Here is the resolution of the Interna-

tional Congress: "In order to get the working class to act as a force in the struggle against capitalism it is indispensable that in each country there should be but one Socialist Party against the capitalist party, just as there is one proletariat." (Applause.) Therefore, all comrades of all factions and organizations which claim to be Socialists, assuming they are, have an imperative duty to do all in their power to bring about Socialist unity of all forces.

A DELEGATE: The point is to remember that.

DEL. KAPLAN: Now, comrades, you do not hear the man who is attacked more than any other man in this country talking against unity. Carey was attacked. I am not talking for Carey, but he don't stand with you men against unity, does he? Comrade Debs was attacked at one time, and yet Debs, after he heard that the Socialist Labor Party had declared for a conference, went down to New York and said, "I am glad of it. I am glad to know that they have come to us." (Applause.) When the history of the future will be recorded and the Socialist co-operative commonwealth will have been established, I contend that the names that will stand out brightest amongst all Socialists will be the names of those who will have shown that they were above personalities and had as a single object the welfare of the movement. If I have been personal in any way I apologize for it, but I am sincere.

Comrades, there are 6,000 men in the Italian Socialist Federation, from reports that I have got. Those men tell me that they will not unite with either the S. L. P. or the S. P. until the two parties themselves unite, and they say also this: "Whenever you have got together, then we will join your party." Comrades, there are fully 50,000 men who were formerly connected with both of our parties. I do not claim or pretend to claim that all these men have gone out of the movement just because of the attacks mentioned, but I do contend that a great portion of those men would realign themselves when we get together or when they once see that we ourselves have settled those differences, and I say we can settle those differences if we eliminate the personalities by meeting one another with the fraternal greeting of fellowship and addressing each

other as comrade and brother. It was Comrade Debs, and I believe it was right here upon this platform that he said, "We will be brothers and comrades; let us get together." I thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you adopt the first minority report, let it be known by saying aye. Contrary, no. The noes have it. (Division called for.) All in favor of adopting the first minority report, let it be known by raising your hands. All who are opposed to adopting the report, raise your hands until counted. The vote is 48 for and 131 against the adoption of the report.

DEL. KAPLAN: I will say that I won't bolt. I am a Socialist. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: We now come to the main report of the committee. We will have it read in your hearing. Every one be quiet while it is read.

Asst. Sec. Strickland read the majority report.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? (Question called for.) If you favor the resolution, let it be known by saying aye. Contrary, no. The ayes have it.

DEL. HOLMAN (Tex.): I rise to make a motion. Whereas, the Socialist party in convention at this moment have passed a resolution inviting all the members of the Socialist Labor Party to unite with the Socialist party, I move you, now that it has been carried so nearly unanimously, that we make it absolutely unanimous without one dissenting voice, so there will be no more friction when they come into the Socialist party.

Objection was heard.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PLATFORM.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will now hear from the Committee on Platform.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS (Ill.), reporting for the Committee on Platform: Mr. Chairman and delegates, the report of the Platform Committee is divided into three parts, as you will see. The first part, the preamble, is practically correct as the main as printed in the Daily Socialist. There are one or two very small verbal changes. The other portions were, as I said this morning, only the report of the subcommittee to this general committee. All the changes

that were afterwards made are not very extensive, and you can make them on the paper; so we did not have it reprinted.

It was decided to present the platform practically in three separate sections; a preamble, being the regular statement of the principles of Socialism; a second portion, which might be called an indictment of capitalism; and a third portion, what is commonly called the immediate demands. Now, I do not know whether it is necessary for me to read that preamble or not. It is practically correct.

DELEGATES: Read it.

DEL. SIMONS: All right. I suppose that is what you want. I don't want to take up time, for I find my voice is failing. I will turn this matter over to Strickland.

The preamble was read by Asst. Sec. Strickland in full, as follows:

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

"Human life depends upon food, clothing and shelter. Only when these are assured are freedom, culture and higher human development possible. To produce food, clothing and shelter, land and machinery are needed. Land by itself does not satisfy human needs. Human labor gets raw materials and food out of the soil by creating machinery and using it upon the land. Whoever has control of land and machinery has control of human labor, and with it of human life and liberty.

"Today the machinery and the land used for industrial purposes are owned by a rapidly decreasing minority. So long as machinery is simple and easily handled by one man, it does not make its owners so powerful that they can dominate the sources of life of others. But when machinery becomes more and more complex and expensive, and requires for its effective operation the organized effort of many workers, its influence reaches over wider and wider circles of life. The owners of such machinery become the dominant class.

"In proportion as the number of such machine owners compared to all other classes decreases, their power in the nation and in the world increases. They bring ever larger masses of working people under their control, reducing them to the point, where muscle and brain are their only productive property. Millions of formerly self-employ-

ing workers thus become the helpless wage slaves of the industrial masters.

"The more the economic power of the ruling class grows, the less useful does it become in the life of the nation. The overwhelming bulk of the useful work of the nation falls upon the shoulders of the classes that either have no other productive property but their manual and mental labor power—the wage workers—or that have but little land and little effective machinery outside of their labor power—the small traders and small farmers. The ruling minority is steadily becoming useless and parasitic.

"A bitter struggle over the division of the products of labor is waged between the exploiting propertied classes on the one hand and the exploited, propertyless class on the other. In this struggle the wage working class cannot expect adequate relief from any reform of the present order or from the dominant class of society.

"The wage workers are therefore the most determined and irreconcilable antagonists of the ruling class. They are also the class which suffers most from the curse of class rule. The fact that a small number of capitalists is permitted to use all the country's resources and social tools for their individual profit, and to make the production of the necessities of our lives the object of their competitive private enterprises and speculations, is at the bottom of all the social evils of our time.

"In spite of the organization of trusts, pools and combinations, the capitalists are powerless to regulate production for social ends. Industries are largely conducted in a planless manner. Through periods of feverish activity the strength and health of the workers are mercilessly undermined, and during periods of enforced idleness the workers are frequently reduced to starvation.

"The climaxes of this chaotic system of production are the regularly recurring industrial depressions and crises which paralyze the nation every fifteen or twenty years.

"In its mad and reckless race for profits the capitalist class is bound to exploit the workers to the very limit of their endurance and to sacrifice their physical, moral and mental welfare to its own insatiable greed. Capitalism

keeps the masses of workingmen in poverty, destitution, physical exhaustion and ignorance. It drags their wives from their homes to the mill and factory. It snatches their children from the playgrounds and schools and grinds their slender bodies and unformed minds into cold dollars. It wantonly disfigures, maims and kills hundreds of thousands of workingmen annually in mines, on railroads and in factories. It drives millions of workers into the ranks of the unemployed and forces large numbers of them into beggary, vagrancy and all forms of crime and vice.

"To maintain their rule over their fellow men, the capitalists must keep in their pay all organs of the public powers, public mind and public conscience. They control the dominating parties and, through them, the elected public officials. They select our executives, bribe our legislatures and corrupt our courts of justice. They own and censor the press. They sway our educational institutions. They own the nation politically and intellectually just as they own it industrially.

"The struggle between wage workers and capitalists grows ever fiercer, and has now become the only vital issue before the American people. The wage-working class, therefore, has the most vital and direct interest in abolishing the capitalist system. But in abolishing the present system, the workingmen will free not only their own class, but also all other classes of modern society: The small farmer, who is today exploited by large capital more indirectly but not less effectively than is the wage laborer; the small manufacturer and trader, who is engaged in a desperate and losing struggle for economic independence in the face of the all-conquering power of concentrated capital; and even the capitalist himself, who is the slave of his wealth rather than its master. The struggle of the working class against the capitalist class, while it is a class struggle, is thus at the same time a struggle for the abolition of all classes and class privileges.

"The private ownership of the land and means of production used for exploitation, is the rock upon which class rule is built; political government is its indispensable instrument. The wage workers cannot be freed from exploitation

without conquering the political power and substituting collective for private ownership of the land and means of production used for exploitation.

"The basis for such transformation is rapidly developing within the very bosom of present capitalist society. The factory system, with its immense machinery and minute division of labor, is rapidly destroying all vestiges of individual production in manufacture. Modern production is already very largely a collective and social process, while the great trusts and monopolies which have sprung up in recent years have had the effect of organizing the work and management of some of our main industries on a national scale, and fitting them for national use and operation.

"In the struggle for freedom the interests of the workers of all nations are identical. The struggle is not only national but international. It embraces the world and will be carried to ultimate victory by the united workers of the world.

"To unite the workers of the nation and their allies and sympathizers of all other classes to this end, is the mission of the Socialist party. In this battle for freedom the Socialist party does not strive to substitute working class rule for capitalist class rule, but to free all humanity from class rule and to realize the international brotherhood of man."

The reading of the preamble was followed by applause.

DEL. SIMONS: That is the first portion. Does the convention want to consider it part by part?

DELEGATES: Yes.

DEL. SIMONS: Then I move you the adoption of this first portion of the preamble. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that we adopt the present preamble as it has been read.

DEL. HOGAN. (Ark.): I desire to offer the following amendment. That clause of the platform meets my approbation, with this exception. I cannot now take time to give you the number of the paragraph. Down about two-thirds of the way in the first column on the second page of the paper I find these words: "To maintain their rule over their fellow men, the capitalists must keep in their pay all organs of the public powers, public mind and public

conscience. They control the dominating parties and, through them, the elected public officials." That is all right, that sentence. Here is the objectionable part: "They select our executives, bribe our legislatures and corrupt our courts of justice. They own and censor the press. They sway our educational institutions. They own the nation politically and intellectually just as they own it industrially." Now I move that that clause, "They select our executives, bribe our legislatures and corrupt the so-called courts of justice," be amended to read this way: "They select the executives of the government, they bribe the legislatures and corrupt the so-called courts of justice." I move that amendment.

A DELEGATE: Changing the word "our" to "the."

The motion was put on the adoption of the amendment, and it was declared carried. A division was called for.

DEL. HOGAN: I object to putting that matter before discussion. I simply proposed the amendment and it was seconded. I take—

DEL. SIMONS: A word of explanation that will perhaps clear this matter up. It was an oversight of mine for which I apologize to the convention I wish to say that we did not get time to have the platform ready in all details as to style, and we wanted to ask of you that you elect from the floor three persons to edit this platform, with the understanding that they were to make no changes in the matter and make no changes without they were all unanimous in each change; no change even as to the letter or a word but what would add smoothness, so that they would only have to look after the literary style. I think it can be done better in that way. As you know, the comrades worked all night last night, and I worked pretty nearly all night too, and we did not get it read over carefully.

DEL. HOLMAN (Tex.): I want the word "justice" stricken out entirely. I have been before the courts.

THE CHAIRMAN: All that are in favor of the amendment lift your hands and hold them until counted by the teller. All opposed to the amendment, lift your hands until counted. The vote is 140 in favor, 11 against.

DEL. O'HARE (Okla.): I make this motion as a suggestion; that after the last paragraph where it states that it is

the purpose of the Socialist party to unite the workers of the nation and their allies and sympathizers, etc., and "In this battle for freedom the Socialist party does not strive to substitute working class rule for capitalist class rule, but to free all humanity from class rule," etc., I move that after that we add "through the substitution of collective ownership and democratic management of the collectively used instruments of production and distribution." I move that this suggestion be referred to this committee, this proposed committee, if it finds a second.

DEL. SIMONS: It may be referred without a motion.

The motion of Del. O'Hare was put and lost.

DEL. STROBELL (N. J.): I move to strike out the seventh paragraph on the second page, "The climaxes of this chaotic system of production are the regularly recurring industrial depressions and crises which paralyze the nation every fifteen or twenty years." That is not so, comrades. Today we are living in a state of feudalism, and the panic that was brought on here and the panics that may be brought on in the future are by the direct will and action of the capitalist class. They have so organized industry and production—

A DELEGATE: No.

DEL. STROBELL: —while here they are putting the reason for these panics as at the behest of a blind, irresponsible force, when it is the capitalist class that is to blame for it all. Why should we not say what we mean? Why should we not correct this and put it right? I move that this be referred back to the committee also.

The motion was seconded, but was lost.

DEL. STROBELL: My motion was that it be referred to the Committee on Platform, not a new committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you insist, Comrade Strobell, that we put the motion the other way?

DEL. STROBELL: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: It was simply the result of us not understanding which committee you wanted it referred to.

The motion was again put, and was lost.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, a motion is in order to elect a committee of three at the suggestion of Comrade

Simons, to look over this document. That is the Platform Committee's suggestion.

DEL. KRUEGER (Wash.): I move that the platform be referred back to the same committee.

DEL. HILLQUIT: As a member of the Platform Committee I will say that the idea of mine was that we want the committee to have more than twenty-four hours' time. Now, we have drawn up this draft for you during the night and in the hurry in the morning at the breakfast table. This is going to serve us for a number of years, and we cannot be careful enough in the revision of every part of it as far as style is concerned. If you will refer it back to the same committee, the work to be done at the same convention, you can gain nothing by it. We want to have three men, each to have a chance to take it up carefully, to go over it line by line and compare notes and agree upon a final reading before they give it out to the world as an official program of the Socialist party.

DEL. TUCK (Cal.): A point of order. The motion to elect a committee of three is out of order because there is a motion before the house to adopt the program.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your point of order is well taken.

DEL. HAGEL (Okla.): I want to offer an amendment and ask a question, what is meant by the next to the last paragraph in the first column, the paragraph beginning with the words in the last part of the paragraph, "The wage workers cannot be freed from exploitation without conquering the political power and substituting collective ownership for private ownership of the land and the means of production used for exploitation."

DEL. SIMONS: There is an extra word in there. The first word "ownership" should be stricken out, and it should properly read like this. It will simply show the emphasis a little plainer: "The wage workers cannot be freed from exploitation without conquering the political power and substituting collective for private ownership of the land and the means of production used for exploitation."

DEL. HAGEL (Okla.): I just wanted to find out about the words "used for exploitation." Land and machinery, is

there any distinction? The land and machinery of the capitalist class, ain't it all used for exploitation?

THE CHAIRMAN: This comrade is asking for a point of information. Of course, if you go to discussing the merits of the question, if they give consent you may do so.

DEL. HAGEL: I ask that the last three words in that paragraph be stricken out, the words "used for exploitation." (Seconded.)

DEL. WORK (Iowa): I oppose the motion. All we want is the collective ownership of the land and the other means of production and distribution that are used for exploitation. The object of Socialism is to stop exploitation, and we only want the collective ownership of those things which are used for exploitation. That is all we need in order to carry out our object.

DEL. BOOMER (Wash.): I wish to make an amendment if it is in order. In adopting this preamble in this platform we ought to consider it very carefully and not begrudge whatever time may be taken up in carefully and slowly considering every paragraph in it. Now, for a number of years I have been one of the soapbox orators and after this convention is over I expect to spend a number of months on the soap box again.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you desire to make a motion?

DEL. BOOMER: I do.

THE CHAIRMAN: Please make it.

DEL. BOOMER: I am coming to it. There are two clauses in this preamble that I wish to have either explained or I wish to amend them. When you read them together they contradict each other. It is the last complete paragraph on the first column of the second page. In the middle of that paragraph it says: "The wage workers cannot be freed from exploitation without conquering the political power," etc. In the last paragraph of that preamble, the last half of the last paragraph—

DEL. BROWER (Ill.): A point of information. Is it not a fact that we are now trying to dispose of the last three words of that paragraph?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. BROWER: What is the use of having two or three others injected into this discussion?

THE CHAIRMAN: The point of

order is well taken. We will now have a vote on this paragraph.

DEL. BOOMER: I asked you if I could make an amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: I thought you wanted to make one in addition to the one already made.

The question was put on the substitute of Del. Hagel, and it was lost.

DEL. BOOMER: After stating "The wage worker cannot be freed from exploitation without conquering the political power," etc., it goes on in the last paragraph of the preamble, and in the middle it says this: "In this battle for freedom the Socialist party does not strive to substitute working class rule for capitalist class rule." I claim that those two sentences contradict each other. I have been trying ever since I have been on the platform and on the soapbox to tell the working class that the object of Socialism was to substitute working class rule and working class government for capitalist class government (applause), and I want to know where I am at, after this is adopted and I go out again to talk and they ask me, "How are you Socialists going to do this and that?" I simply think we ought to eliminate that statement where it says we are not going to substitute working class government for capitalist class government. How else can we bring in the cooperative commonwealth unless we first set up a working class government and put out the capitalist class government? I move to strike out this part of that section where it says that we do not intend to substitute working class government for capitalist class government. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: A motion has been made and seconded—

DEL. STRICKLAND: Read it as it is there.

THE CHAIRMAN: And then read the amendment.

DEL. SIMONS: "In this battle for freedom the Socialist party does not strive to substitute working class rule for capitalist class rule, but to free humanity from class rule." I believe Comrade Boomer has seen the book called the Communist Manifesto. That phrase is taken almost word for word from it.

DEL. BRADFORD (Cal.): I wish to offer a substitute for the amendment, to insert there "as an ultimate aim" after that statement. (Seconded.)

DEL. HUNTER (N. Y.): I think that by putting the word "only" in so as to read "only strive," the sentence reading "In this battle for freedom the Socialist party does not only strive to substitute working class rule for capitalist class rule," it will clear it up. It happens that this exact sentence was written not only in the Communist Manifesto, but in the first preamble of the International, and was written by the hand of Karl Marx himself.

DEL. BOOMER: I accept that amendment.

DEL. PREVEY (Ohio): I am surprised that a man who believes in the International Socialist party should object to that clause in the platform of the Socialist party. We maintain that we do propose to substitute working class rule for capitalist rule, but in the substitution of working class rule for capitalist rule the capitalists themselves in that age will become workers, and we destroy class rule and we establish a government for all humanity. (Applause.) We are simply not going to reverse the conditions we have now; we do not propose to put the working class into power and give them an opportunity to exploit another class in society by making the capitalist class the subservient class, but we propose to destroy class rule and substitute working class rule, and everybody will be part of the government so that it will be the rule of all humanity. I believe the platform is all right as it is, and it should read as it is. (Applause.) I have heard objections made to the propaganda of the Socialist party on that very proposition. They say, "What are you going to do with the capitalist class when you substitute working class rule?" And we have had to qualify repeatedly, owing to the position of many agitators who went out over the country, owing to the speakers themselves not understanding the statements which they attributed to Karl Marx. Karl Marx is all right, but we had to have a working class before we had a Karl Marx. Let us understand working class philosophy in the way Karl Marx did, and then there will be harmony.

DEL. LEWIS (Ill.): I am not going to make a speech on this. There is something further along in this platform that needs fixing, but so far as

this is concerned, Comrade Hunter's suggestion—

DEL. REILLY: A point of order, that he cannot offer motions to amend other portions of the platform when one is under discussion.

DEL. LEWIS: I am not offering one. I have not offered any motion. I am speaking to Comrade Hunter's suggestion. The last time we rushed the platform through without criticism or amendment, and we paid the penalty for it. So far as I am concerned I think this is entirely unobjectionable. I think this clause as it stands is in complete harmony with the Socialist philosophy as it is taught in every standard book of Socialist literature. Comrade Hunter's suggestion of inserting the word "only" would develop a contradiction in this sentence which does not now exist. The point is as stated by the delegate from Ohio, Comrade Prevey, that when the working class becomes the dominant class it ceases to be a working class and it becomes the human race. (Applause.)

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): I agree with the comrade from Washington. It is true that when the working class takes possession of the powers of government it will be its mission to abolish capitalism and abolish all classes. But it is also true, as recognized by all authorities on Socialism that it will take some time for the working class to achieve it, and that capitalism in some forms will continue to exist, and it will be the duty of the working class to abolish it, and that will not be done in one day or two days, either. Therefore it is not the aim of the Socialist party and it will not be the function of the Socialist party to entirely destroy capitalism and entirely abolish classes. It will be the aim of Socialism—it is the aim, the ultimate aim of the Socialist movement, that is true; and therefore I am in favor of expressing the philosophy and also the aim of Marx. They all speak for Marx here; I also speak for Marx, and I am in favor of amending that clause to read—

THE CHAIRMAN: There is a motion to amend and one to amend the amendment.

DEL. SLOBODIN: As a substitute for the whole.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right.

DEL. SLOBODIN: That "In this battle for freedom it is the ultimate

aim of the Socialist movement not to substitute working class rule for capitalist class rule," etc. (Seconded.)

The substitute was put and lost.

DEL. TOOLE (Md.): I move to make this read this way: "In this battle for freedom the Socialist party strives to substitute working class rule only to the end that all humanity be freed from class rule, and to the realization of the international brotherhood of man." That is the proposition. (Seconded.)

The substitute of Del. Toole was put and lost.

DEL. HOGAN (Ark.): I have a substitute what is a substitute. (Laughter.) If you will listen to me a moment you will adopt this substitute. I recognize the fact that in stating this matter thus partially some, and a majority, of the delegates are not pleased. In fact, taking that paragraph and other paragraphs in connection, a seeming contradiction is involved. If you will allow me to move the substitution of this paragraph to read as follows it will suit you: "In this battle for freedom the Socialist party shall strive to free all humanity from class rule and to realize the international brotherhood of man."

THE CHAIRMAN: Lost for want of a second.

DEL. MAYNARD (Colo.): Is it the understanding that there is not an amendment to the amendment? The comrade over there accepted the amendment of Comrade Hunter. I do not care which way you vote it, as a substitute or as an amendment; the chair will choose which it is; but I would have you insert these three words after "capitalist class rule;" "but by working class victory to free all humanity." That is all right, to my mind, but if this convention finds it ambiguous, what in the world will ignorant men outside do? But I say these three words would avoid all ambiguity.

THE CHAIRMAN: Read it as it would then sound.

DEL. HOGAN: Was there a second to my motion?

THE CHAIRMAN: No.

A DELEGATE: Yes, there was.

THE CHAIRMAN: I didn't hear any second. If he insists that the motion was seconded I will put the question.

The motion on the amendment of Del. Hogan was put and lost.

DEL. MAYNARD: With my amendment it would read: "In this battle for freedom the Socialist party does not strive to substitute working class rule for capitalist class rule, but by working class victory to free all humanity from class rule and to realize the international brotherhood of man."

DEL. STRICKLAND: Second.

ASST. SEC. REILLY then read the substitute of Del. Maynard, which was carried by a vote of 94 to 52.

DEL. D'ORSAY (Mass.), moved the previous question, and it was seconded and declared carried.

The Declaration of Principles as amended was then put and carried.

DEL. SIMONS: The rest of the platform is an analysis of the present conditions.

The platform proper was then read, as follows:

PLATFORM OF 1908.

"The Socialist party, in national convention assembled, in entering upon the campaign of 1908, again presents itself to the people as the party of the working class, and as such it appeals for the support of all workers of the United States and of all citizens who sympathize with the great and just cause of labor.

"We are at this moment in the midst of one of those industrial breakdowns that periodically paralyze the life of the nation. The much-boasted era of our national prosperity has been followed by one of general misery. Factories, mills and mines are closed, work is abandoned, and millions of men, ready, willing and able to provide the nation with all the necessities and comforts of life are forced into idleness and starvation. Within recent times the trusts and monopolies have attained an enormous and menacing development. They have acquired the power to dictate to us the terms upon which we shall be allowed to live. The trusts fix the prices of our bread, meat and sugar, of our coal, oil and clothing, of our raw material and machinery, of all the necessities of life and even the prices of our coffins.

"The ruling class has seized upon the present desperate condition of the workers as an opportunity for a re-

newed onslaught on the organized labor movement. The highest courts of the country have within the last year rendered decision after decision depriving the workers of rights which they had won by generations of struggle.

"The attempt to destroy the Western Federation of Miners, although defeated by the solidarity of organized labor and the Socialist movement, revealed the existence of a far-reaching and unscrupulous conspiracy on the part of the ruling powers against the organizations of labor.

"In their efforts to take the lives of the faithful leaders of the miners the conspirators violated the state laws and the federal constitution in a manner seldom equaled even in a country so completely dominated as is the United States by the profit-seeking class.

"The congress of the United States has shown its contempt for the interests of labor as plainly and unmistakably as have the other branches of government. The legislation for which the labor organizations have continuously petitioned has been rejected. The scant legislation apparently passed for their benefit has been so distorted as to injure those whom it pretended to help.

"The working class of the United States cannot expect any remedy for its wrongs from the present ruling class or from the dominant parties. So long as a small number of individuals are permitted to use the common resources of the nation's wealth for their private profit in competition with each other and for the exploitation of their fellowmen, industrial depressions are bound to occur at certain intervals. No currency reform or other legislative measure proposed by capitalist reformers can avail against these fatal results of a system of utter anarchy in production.

"So long as the wealth production of the country is based on individual competition the fierce struggles of this competition will inevitably lead to combinations and trusts. No amount of government regulation, or of publicity, or of restrictive legislation will arrest the natural course of modern industrial development.

"So long as our courts, legislatures and executive offices remain in the hands of the ruling classes and their agents, our government will be used in

the interests of these classes as against the toilers.

"Political parties are but the expression of economic class interests. The Republican, the Democratic, and the so-called 'Independence' parties and all parties other than the Socialist party, are financed, directed and controlled by the representatives of different groups of the ruling class.

"In the maintenance of class government both the Democratic and Republican parties have been equally guilty. The Republican party has had control of the national government and has been directly and actively responsible for these wrongs. The Democratic party, while saved from direct responsibility by its political impotence, has shown itself equally subservient to the aims of the capitalist class whenever and wherever it has been in power. The old chattel slave-owning aristocracy of the south, which was the backbone of the Democratic party, has been supplanted by a child slave plutocracy. In the great cities of our country the Democratic party is allied with the criminal element or with the Republican party in maintaining the interest of the possessing class.

"The various 'reform' movements and parties which have sprung up within recent years are but the clumsy expression of widespread popular discontent with the present system of exploitation and graft. They are not based on an intelligent understanding of the historical development of civilization and of the economic and political needs of our time. They are bound to perish as the numerous middle class reform movements of the past have perished."

DEL. SIMONS: I move you the adoption of the platform. (Seconded.)

DEL. WILLIAMS (Minn.): I think there is a good deal of unnecessary confusion in one paragraph here. At the foot of the second column on the second page, third paragraph from the bottom, we find this: "So long as our courts, legislatures and executive offices remain in the hands of the ruling classes and their agents, our government will be used in the interests of these classes as against the toilers." I believe that we ought to make this a little bit more distinct. It has been the contention of the Socialist party and the Socialist expon-

ents on the platform for a number of years, that we are fast approaching a time—aye, have reached that time—when there are but two classes in society, and we confuse the issue by claiming that we have these classes. The paragraph should read: "So long as the courts, legislatures and executive officers remain in the hands of the ruling class and their agents, the government will be used in the interests of this class as against the toilers." I move the adoption of this clause as last read. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: That suggestion is accepted by the committee, I understand. If there is no objection the committee will accept the suggestion.

A delegate suggested changing "our" courts to "the" courts, and "our" government to "the" government.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the committee accept?

DEL. HILLQUIT: As to the last suggestion, I do not accept, and I want to say we made a very grave mistake before by accepting something similar. Now, there is absolutely no use and no sense in separating ourselves from the American people and the American country. If we do that, we have no standing in court at all. If we say "the government," not "our government," "the nation" of which we form no part and we object to "ours," then they might well ask, "What is coming to you in this case if you have nothing to do with it, if you form no part of the nation, and why do you want to reform that nation or any part of its institutions at all?" I say that we, the Socialist party, are part of the American nation, and we are going to keep our place. (Applause.) I say it is our government, our courts. I maintain it is not the government and the courts of the Socialist party, but the government and the courts of the people of the United States, of which we constitute a part, for which we speak, for which we demand certain reforms. (Applause.)

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): As one of the committee I also protest against the change. You cannot deny the existence of the middle class. And by simply declaring here that it ought not to exist, it will not cease to exist. You cannot do that by resolution. As long as it is a fact that there is still a middle class you have to recognize the fact. Why should we cut out any mention of it in the platform? The two classes in this

other sentence are mentioned together. I join with my colleague in protesting against this change.

DEL. BERTHA M. STARK-WEATHER (Cal.): Comrade Chairman, in the last paragraph, "As measures calculated to strengthen the power of the working class in its fight for the realization of this ultimate aim," I want to ask the Platform Committee what ultimate aim they have mentioned? There is no mention of an ultimate aim yet. They have merely given the grievances, and given them magnificently, but they have mentioned no ultimate aim. Here they mention an ultimate aim.

THE CHAIRMAN: You ask for information?

DEL. STARKWEATHER: I do, from the Platform Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: The ultimate aim is the freedom of the whole human race.

DEL. O'HARE: Let me state that I have just asked Comrade Branstetter, a member of the committee, and Comrade Simons about that point. There is evidently a rhetorical error there, and Comrade Simons will answer that in a moment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrade Simons has the floor.

DEL. SIMONS: I will let you answer, Comrade Hillquit.

DEL. HILLQUIT: I wish to state that the point is very well taken.

DEL. SIMONS: That is what I think.

DEL. HILLQUIT: The fact of the matter is that we had another paragraph in front of that, which stated the ultimate aim. Then when we assembled in the back room we took that paragraph and transferred it to the end, without making a change to correspond. There will be a few more places of the same kind which will require revision. This is one.

DEL. WHEAT (Cal.): I desire to take issue with the comrades who have spoken regarding the ruling classes. It is not true that there are two classes of exploiters in this country. The capitalist class has done away with the middle class. There was a time when the old feudal class was in existence, and the capitalistic exploiters came in as a middle class. But today the exploitation is done entirely by the capitalist class.

DEL. TOOLE: Big or little.

DEL. WHEAT: Big and little to-

gether. They exploit in one and the same way. It is capitalist exploitation that has driven every other form of exploitation out of the world, and that is the reason why the working class can now come forward with some chance for victory, because it is face to face with the single dominant exploiting class, with no middle class to fog the issue in any way, shape or manner.

I desire to move, if I may be permitted, that the suggestion that was offered by one of the comrades here that the plural be changed to the singular, be adopted. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: A motion has been made and seconded that the plural exchange to the singular be adopted.

DEL. WHEAT: And I desire to add also—I neglected to do as I intended to—to also make a motion that “our” be changed to “the” in the same paragraph. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The secretary will read that as it will read provided the motion to amend carries.

SEC. REILLY: If this is adopted the paragraph will read as follows: “So long as the courts, legislatures and executive offices remain in the hands of the ruling class and its agents, the government will be used in the interests of this class as against the toilers.”

DEL. ANDERSON (Minn.): A point of order. Comrade Williams made that motion originally, and it was seconded, and I would like to have the question divided so that we can vote on each clause by itself.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair failed to hear a second to the motion of the comrade.

DEL. BERGER: I want to speak on behalf of the committee. I do not think that that after we worked for a day and a half continuously—now we should go back on our work and have it undone without defense,—especially since we are right. (Laughter.) I will again say that the mere fact that you here rule the middle class out of existence will not abolish the middle class. The mere fact that a comrade from California says that there is no middle class, that there are only two classes—the capitalists and the proletarians, does not make it so. All you have to do is to go to any village, town or smaller city, and you will find that there is a middle class. And even you who are denying the existence of a middle class are, on the

other hand, continually talking about the middle class and about middle-class reformers. You also claim that the Democratic party is the representative of the middle class is still the largest class in deny its existence. You shut your eyes and deny that it exists. I tell you the middle class, and at the same time you existence today. The farmers and small tradesmen are at least twenty times more in number than the capitalists. The capitalist class is very small. The middle class is still a very considerable part of the population of this country, and a very considerable part of the population of any civilized country. That is why we say, in order to have a class-conscious, clear-cut platform, we must mention the two classes besides the proletariat. That is all, and I cannot see why the so-called radicals from California, the people who try to appear as ultra-class-conscious, deny the existence of a middle class. I always thought that you claim out there that we in the middle west are middle class Socialists. Now, if there is no middle class, how can there be middle class Socialists? (Applause.) I even suspect that most of these impossibilistic comrades from the coast belong themselves to the middle class. (Laughter.) I will also say that a party like the one we have in Milwaukee—and 95 per cent of our organization is made up of workingmen—such a party, I say, is just the one that will look things and conditions square in the eye and state them as they are. Comrades, I ask you not to change the wording of the draft, but instead I would suggest that to the following sentence: “measures calculated to strengthen the power of the working class in its fight for the realization of the ultimate aim,” we add “the collective ownership of the means of production and distribution.” I say we add these five or six words, “the collective ownership of the means of production and distribution.”

THE CHAIRMAN: Did you make that as a substitute?

DEL. BERGER: I am not making a motion. I will let you make the motion. However, I will also call attention to the fact that at the end of the entire platform we say that all our planks are only steps taken in the amelioration of the present system and that no proletarian should rest until we get complete control of the means of production and distribution.

The motion to amend was lost.

DEL. WILLIAMS (Minn.): I want to insist that the question be divided.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did you have a motion to make?

DEL. WILLIAMS: No, I wish to speak on the last amendment by this comrade from California.

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment made by the comrade from California was lost.

DEL. WILLIAMS: That original motion, Comrade Chairman, but I made this motion for the particular reason that I like to see at least some degree of consistency in a Socialist platform as well as in any other document. Of course, I understand that Comrade Berger is right, for he has told us so (laughter), and the committee is no doubt all right or they would not tell us so. We have the committee telling us in one part of this platform that the capitalist class “own and censor the press. They sway our educational institutions. They own the nation politically and intellectually, just as they own it industrially.” Now, if the capitalist class owns the country and if the capitalist class own it politically, industrially, intellectually, and every other way, how is it then possible that we have other classes also owning it? (Applause.) This motion is the only one that is consistent with the remainder of the platform. If this part that we first read is true and is not a lie, the last part of it is a mistake. The one is necessary in order to the efficiency and consistency of the remainder of it.

DEL. STROBEL (N. J.): I ask your patience and consideration just a minute. I am going to move to strike out a paragraph in this platform. The portion I move to have stricken out, I do it now in order to impress upon your attention something which you ought to know and not throw overboard recklessly, thinking it meant nothing, because there is a great deal of meaning in this claim. I move to strike out this paragraph: “We are at this moment in the midst of one of those industrial breakdowns that periodically paralyze the life of the nation.” I think these scientists who built this platform must have been hypnotized by a set of phrases. Now, you want to look at this very carefully. We are no longer in the formative stage of capitalism. We have arrived at a stage where every-

thing goes by rule and method. We do not bring on panics because there is an industrial depression behind them, but panics are brought on today by the will of the capitalist class. If I had more time I could state to you, but you know as well as I do that this last panic is not the result of any industrial depression, of any industrial cause. They brought it on as panics at no preceding time were brought on. This panic was brought on by the deliberate will of the capitalist class to achieve for themselves the three or four things that they set out to gain. I want you to realize that there is nothing—not simply the idea that we want to push this matter, but people have come to me on the floor and said this thing ought to be discussed and must be taken up. I move therefore that this paragraph be stricken out. (Seconded.)

The motion to strike out was put and lost.

DEL. O. F. BRANSTETTER (Okla.): With the consent of the committee I would like to suggest that this last paragraph of the platform be changed by substituting “its” instead of “this.” If we correct that discrepancy it would then read: “As measures calculated to strengthen the power of the working class in its fight for the realization of its ultimate aim,” we demand the following, etc. And as Comrade Berger explained, there is a further declaration as to what the ultimate aim is, at the end of the demand. I make that motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the committee accept the suggestion of Comrade Branstetter?

DEL. C. L. FURMAN (N. Y.): I move to strike out the following: “The trusts fix the prices of our bread, meat and sugar, of our coal, oil and clothing,” to strike out those words so as to make it read—

THE CHAIRMAN: There is a motion before the house to refer this to an editing committee of three.

DEL. FURMAN: This particular sentence?

THE CHAIRMAN: The whole platform.

DEL. FURMAN: Then I wish to call their attention to that sentence.

DEL. HILLQUIT: I desire to amend the motion; not that we refer it to a committee, but that we adopt the declaration of principles and plat-

form, and that we elect a committee of three to edit the style of both.

DEL. STRICKLAND: I accept that substitute.

DEL. HILLQUIT: In other words, we are adopting at once. That committee so elected will finish its labors within three weeks and transmit to the National Secretary a revised and final copy of the declaration of principles, platform and program.

DEL. STRICKLAND: I accept that motion.

DEL. BROWER: I move the previous question on the adoption of the platform.

DEL. LEWIS (Ill.): Does this mean that we should not leave this program as we have it already?

DEL. HILLQUIT: No, on the contrary, this committee is to take all suggestions, all offerings, and concern itself with the style and language only, and make no change in the substance.

The previous question was ordered.

THE CHAIRMAN: As many as wish to refer this to an editing committee of three, make it known by saying aye. Contrary, no. It is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF CANDIDATE FOR PRESIDENT.

DEL. STRICKLAND: I move to suspend the order and take it up tomorrow, and to proceed now to the nomination of presidential and vice-presidential candidates.

The motion was seconded. The previous question being moved, was declared carried. A division was called for.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you favor proceeding with the nominations, raise your hands. All opposed. The motion is carried.

DEL. CALLERY (Mo.): I would like to ask if nominations are now in order.

THE CHAIRMAN: They are.

DEL. STEDMAN: I move that the first ballot be an informal ballot. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: A motion has been made and seconded that the first ballot be an informal ballot. As many as favor the motion make it known by saying aye. Contrary, no. The motion is lost. Del. Callery has the floor.

Nomination of Eugene V. Debs.

DEL. CALLERY: Comrade Chair-

man and Comrade Delegates of the convention: After a session of five days the Socialist party in national convention has at last come to the most important work which it shall be called upon to perform, the nomination of our standard bearers for this campaign of 1908. The Socialist party here in national convention assembled is but the latest expression on the political field, of that historic class struggle that is as old as civilization itself.

The thousands of widowed mothers and fatherless children in all of our great industrial centers, the hundreds of unmarked graves where rest the sacred dust of our martyred comrades, all bear mute testimony to this irrepressible conflict.

As evidence of this, look to Homestead, to Hazelton, to Chicago, to the Coeur d'Alenes and to Colorado; and in every one of these conflicts between the forces of capital and those of labor, the powers of government, whether under the control of the Democratic or Republican party, have always been used to conserve the interests of capital and to crush down labor. So thoroughly has this fact been demonstrated that labor recognizes in order to obtain its freedom, it must organize politically as well as industrially. But the question now is—in what kind of politics will it engage?

Where the leaders of the two great political parties stand with reference to the rights of labor, but brief mention need be made at this time. Let me point out but one instance, that of Colorado. When Moyer, Haywood and Pettibone had been kidnapped upon a perjured requisition from the State of Colorado and left lay in the prisons of Idaho for nearly two years—after they had been denied all of their constitutional rights and were standing in the shadow of the gallows with the millions of the mine owners' association pitted against them, with the Republican governors of two States against them in that critical crisis, Theodore Roosevelt, the Republican President of the United States, so far forgot all regard for justice that he stepped down from his high position and denounced these defenseless working men as "undesirable citizens." And when he did this, he

proved himself to be one of the most despicable cowards in this country. And what stand did W. J. Bryan take, the "Champion of the Great Common People"? For two campaigns, in 1896 and 1900, he went about this country with crocodile tears in his eyes, pleading for the constitutional rights of the Filipinos, and when three of his fellow-countrymen, with all of their constitutional rights outraged, were in the clutches of the mine owners of the West, he said not one word in their behalf, notwithstanding the fact that he had been appealed to time and again by labor bodies all over the country; not one word did he say till the jury in the Haywood case rendered a verdict of "Not guilty," when he condemned himself in his speech at Joliet by saying he was glad the verdict was not guilty—he never thought those men were guilty. He thought more of his personal ambitions that he did of the lives of three of his fellow-countrymen; and Mr. Bryan is the possible candidate of the Democratic party for President.

Where does Taft, the probable candidate of the Republican party, stand on the labor question? Just one instance is all that is necessary upon this point. A short time ago he took a trip through Europe and while in Russia he dined with the Royal family and drank to the health of that bloody butcher, the autocrat of the blackest despotism on all the earth; one who has sent the best men and the noblest women of Russia over the ice-covered plains of Siberia to suffer a slow crucifixion. This is Taft, the "friend of labor," the aspirant for the nomination on the Republican ticket. And so it stands. Thousands of workingmen all over this country are conscious of this fact today, and their eyes are upon this convention, asking themselves who our standard bearer will be?

I have the name of a comrade in mind, who, if nominated by this convention, will bring a message of hope to the weary mothers in the sweatshops, the thousands of child slaves in the factories, and to all of those who with tired hands and saddened faces bear the burdens of the world's work. It has been said of this comrade, whose name I am about to men-

tion, that he has made mistakes, to which we answer: "To err is human; to forgive is divine." This comrade bears the battle scars of twenty-five years of service in the labor movement. I wish, comrades, to place before this convention for your consideration, the name of one who is known to us all, our loved and loving comrade, tried and true—Eugene V. Debs, of Indiana.

(The nomination was received with great applause and long continued enthusiastic demonstrations.)

Second to Nomination of Debs.

DEL. SPARGO (N. Y.): Comrade Chairman, comrades and friends, I rise on behalf of the delegation from the State of New York to second the nomination of Eugene V. Debs of Indiana. (Applause.) I cannot hope to add anything to the eloquent address made by the comrade who placed Debs's name before this convention. I am sure that every delegate of this convention and every comrade present in this hall will agree that the spirit of the nomination, the spirit of the address in which the nomination was made was alike worthy of our loved Comrade Debs and of the best traditions of the Socialist party. (Applause.)

I am sure that we are all agreed that if the spirit and the sentiment of the speech of the delegate who nominated Debs characterize our campaign, the cause of Socialism will not suffer in this great fight of the year 1908. Comrades and friends, I need only ask you to reflect what it is that we most require in our presidential candidate. We need, above everything else, as our standard bearer, a man who will give us back our standard unsullied and unspoiled as he takes it; we need a man who will carry it from east to west and from north to south not merely without dishonor, but with the spirit of inspiration and of the revolution of the working class along with it. (Applause.) Eugene V. Debs is not only a man who will carry the spirit of the working class revolution along with its banner; he is the personification of the revolt of the working class in this country. (Applause.)

I look upon Eugene V. Debs not as a man to express the spirit of revolu-

tion, but as the personal embodiment of that revolution itself. (Applause.) Eugene V. Debs drank the genius and passion for liberty from his mother's breasts. (Applause.) Eugene V. Debs not only drank the passion and genius for liberty from his mother's breasts, but he has breathed that genius and that passion with every breath of his own in these twenty-five years. (Applause.)

The hand clasp of Eugene V. Debs to his wearied comrade wherever he finds him is as the shower of rain upon the parched earth. The very presence of Eugene V. Debs is the greatest inspiration I know for the working class movement in this country. (Applause.)

New York has no favorite son to present for this position. New York does not desire that one of its members should be chosen. It has a favorite comrade, a comrade endeared to New York by all his long service to this great cause of the working class, and that comrade, Eugene V. Debs, will, I am confident, go through this campaign as he has gone through other campaigns, towering above all other candidates, not merely in ability, not merely in capacity as a campaigner, but in the deep fundamental character that we are seeking for. (Applause.)

You tell me that my comrade Debs has made mistakes. You tell me that my comrade Debs is not perfect. And I answer you back, it is true, but the mistakes of Eugene V. Debs have done him more credit than the right things that many other people have done. (Great applause.) You tell me that Eugene V. Debs is not a god. I answer back, no, but Eugene V. Debs is human and so are we; and because he is human, the most human of us all perhaps in a large sense, I say to you there is no man living today who is better qualified to carry our banner than Eugene V. Debs. (Applause.)

When Eugene V. Debs was born I think the morning stars must have sung together. (Applause.) When Eugene V. Debs was cradled I think that the great spirit of liberty must have watched with proud rejoicing and said, "Here is my champion; here is my voice to cry out to all the world and say, as

the prophet said of old, 'Let my people go!'" (Applause.)

Comrade Chairman, when Eugene V. Debs speaks there rises before the gaze of every workingman in this country whose heart responds to the yearning for liberty, a vision of breaking chains, a vision of the uprising protesting host marching out of its misery, marching out of its servitude, marching on and on to that great freedom to which we all aspire. Therefore I second the nomination of Eugene V. Debs. (Cheers.)

Nomination of A. M. Simons.

DEL. STEDMAN (Ill.): Mr. Chairman, comrades and delegates, it was not more or only a trifle more than eight years ago that Comrade Berger and myself and one or two others were perhaps more urgent than any other friends who took that man by the hand, and, if you please, really forced him upon the political ticket of the Social Democratic party in opposition to thousands, or at least hundreds, who were opposed to him, but upon knowing him, learned to love him. So that when I shall oppose—I will not say oppose, but present the name of another candidate, no one who at least has any recollection of the past shall challenge my admiration, my respect or my affection for Eugene V. Debs. From the time when he was sunstruck down in Virginia and all through, if you please, the two great campaigns that followed, we watched him, and we watched him frequently pale under the terrific strain of those two great fights. Some few months ago, some of you may not know it, but there was an operation that took place upon his throat. If in this campaign he ever attempts to make a talking campaign he will probably close his existence so far as—

DELEGATES: No.

DEL. STEDMAN: One moment. I understand full well the situation. I understand two things perfectly—that the easiest time to appeal to the emotions of any audience is when they are exhausted; I understand very well that reason retires and emotion remains afterwards. But mark what I say, I am perfectly willing to let a few days or a few months answer the argument which I present. First con-

sider that I admit that a campaign may be made through literature issued from Girard, Kansas. I also admit that he may write a great many articles. (Hisses.)

DEL. POPE (Mo.): I rise to a point of personal privilege. I am a Socialist, and I deny the right of any Socialist to hiss any other Socialist. (Applause, and hissing renewed.)

DEL. STEDMAN: I understand, my comrades—

DEL. TOOLE (Md.): A point of order. I want to know whether it is in order for a man who gets up to nominate another man, to oppose at the same time the nomination of another. And I want to know, further, if so, whether those comrades who nominated Comrade Eugene V. Debs will have a right to reply.

THE CHAIRMAN: They should have that right.

DEL. STEDMAN: I do not object to that opportunity in the least, sir, and I want to say it is very evident that some have misunderstood my reference to a literary campaign. You evidently by your demonstration indicated, if you please, that in my mind was something that was not lingering there at all. What I meant to say was this, if he cannot take the stump he must accomplish it through a literary campaign. If he can take the stump, his name will draw terrific audiences, and, my friends, if you nominate another who by the prestige of your nomination can draw large audiences, do you not double the effectiveness of your campaign? For the greatest tribute you can ever pay to Eugene V. Debs would be to strike him from the possibilities of your coming election.

It may be you want him; no doubt we do. But after all, what is the object of our movement? It must be above everything else to carry the cause of Socialism, its propaganda and its work, to the great mass of people in the United States. If you have a man who can fill a hall, who can secure a great audience by reason of his personality, do you not double the effectiveness by nominating a person who by reason of that nomination can equally draw a great audience?

Do you think, if you please, that possibly by a nomination at this time

you preclude to some extent a nomination four years hence? By no means. And do you think that by nominating for instance another you by any possible process insult even to the slightest degree the party who has been mentioned as a candidate? What are his views? They are these: "When I am commanded I obey." Yet, if you please, his own idea was not that he should be nominated, and I want to read you a letter received from him this morning. I sent a telegram to him asking him to come to the convention because of some reports that I had received. It is as follows:

"Seymour Stedman, Chicago, Ill.—My Dear Steddy:—Telegram sent by yourself, Williams and Berger has been received this moment. I am sorry not to be able to comply with your request. The 'Appeal' has undertaken certain special work of some importance on the strength of my being here, and I cannot well abandon it at this time. I should be happy, of course, to attend the convention and to meet the comrades if the situation were such that I could do so. I see that my friends have again been very kind to me in this matter of nomination. I had hoped that my name would not be mentioned in that connection this year, and have done what I could to discourage it; the reasons for this purely from the party standpoint, seem quite apparent to me. As for myself personally, I never had any ambition along that line"—which we all know—"If I do anything worthy of keeping my name alive I prefer that it shall be done as a private in the ranks and not by having my name associated with some public office or with what may seem to be the desire of some public office. With loving regards, etc., I am yours in the same old way, Eugene V. Debs."

Now, I cannot understand why, simply reasoning as to the impending campaign and that which can be made most effective, that you should regard my attitude as one personally offensive. And yet that seems to be the disposition. Our party is not so entirely bankrupt in ability as some are inclined to believe it to be. The Democratic party may need its necessary man continuously. It is not absolutely necessary in this party. If

you can have two on the platform, who by virtue, the one of his name and the other by nomination, you double the strength and effectiveness of your party organization.

I want to mention another name for your consideration. At the time Gene, or a little after he finally left the locomotive and commenced his work in the labor movement, another man left the farm and commenced his work, and it has been tremendous work, for the cause. That man took hold of a populist publishing house and through his energy and through his work has developed its proportions so that in a single year under a co-operate plan it disposed of nearly \$30,000.00 worth of Socialist literature. He takes an old populist magazine, and it in turn becomes the International Socialist Review. He is a man who has worked continuously for the movement, and no one can question his ability as an informed speaker, as a good talker, as a persistent writer, and as one who at the present time is serving the Chicago Daily Socialist as its editor; a man who can write; a man who can speak; a man who I feel can fairly and fully and most excellently represent the Socialist movement in the impending campaign. You would have Debs with his meetings; you would have this comrade with his meetings, and you would simply add two great factors together in one instead of limiting it to either one; and for that reason I present to you for your consideration Comrade A. M. Simons. (Applause.)

Second to Nomination of Debs.

DEL. O'HARE (Okla.): Mr. Chairman and fellow comrades, I had hoped it would not be necessary for me or for Oklahoma to say a word in behalf of that fearless candidate of the working class, Eugene V. Debs. (Applause.) I had hoped that the friends of Debs would know that he today is able, as able as he has ever been, and more able to defend the cause of the working class from any rostrum in any part of the world. (Applause.) A few days ago I sat in a coach at Girard with the great loving arm of Debs around my waist. I asked him, "Comrade Debs, stay on the train and come with us to Chicago." He said, "No, you do not

need me there. The Socialist movement is now so large that it can spare any man." I said, "Comrade Debs, if you are nominated for the presidency of the United States, you will serve?" He said, "I hope that I will not be nominated. There are many who are more entitled to the nomination than myself." I asked him and I asked Fred D. Warren, "What is the health of Eugene V. Debs?" For eight years I have watched this man, this comrade, with all the love that a younger brother can give to an elder brother, for it was the hand of Eugene V. Debs that welcomed me into the Socialist party eight years ago in Turner Hall in St. Louis (applause), and since then I have recognized him as my elder brother in this movement. I asked Warren and I asked all the men in Girard, "What is Debs' health?" They said, "Look at his face, look at the shine of health and that loving, inspiring countenance." After one year's rest, after a year without care, he has sat down and pounded a typewriter with no thought of the morrow except to hurl his thunderbolts in the face of Roosevelt and the rest of the capitalist class. Eugene V. Debs is fit, and until I receive a telegram, or this convention receives a telegram, from him saying that he positively declines the nomination, I and the Oklahoma delegation will give our vote for Eugene V. Debs. (Applause.)

It has been charged that the nomination of Eugene V. Debs will not be sane and safe for the Socialist Party; that he stands for terrorism. I say he does stand for terrorism. I say that the capitalist class of America are more in terror of his voice and his pen than of the voice or of the pen of any other man on the American continent. (Applause.) I say, in accordance and in harmony with the thought of our Comrade Spargo, that Eugene V. Debs is the embodiment of the American proletarian movement. (Applause.) He is great, he is uncompromising, he is loving, he is powerful, he is resistless in his work for the working class, he is remorseless in his aim at the complete and uncompromising overthrow of the capitalist system of production. (Applause.) Let me make one point, and then yield the floor. Eugene V. Debs

is well, and he will conduct a campaign from any place that you ask him. (Applause.) But I will say that you must not ask him to make a trip like Comrade Hanford had to make. You must not ask him to make a trip like you did before. It will not kill him, but it would kill any other man in the Socialist movement. (Applause.)

My friends, with all due respect and admiration for Comrade Simons, I wish that he and other nominees who may be named would withdraw their names that we might make this nomination unanimous. (Applause.) Listen; it is not because we have not enough presidential timber in the Socialist party. If Debs should decline, there are a number of comrades who are perfectly capable of carrying the red flag of revolt for the proletarian movement. Not that they are not equal to the occasion, but because if we were to turn down Eugene V. Debs we would be repudiating the policy that he pursued which has made Theodore Roosevelt declare against the Socialist movement (Voices, "no, no"), and declare that we are undesirable citizens. With all due respect to Comrade Simons and to the other comrades that may be nominated, I again affirm the decision of Oklahoma and of the Southwest generally to give our ballot for that man who, as I say, expresses the hopes and aspirations of the workingmen and working women of the Socialist movement of America. I thank you. (Applause.)

DEL. BROWER, of Illinois, secured the floor and yielded it, upon request, to Delegate Hanford, of New York.

Second to Nomination of Debs.

DEL. HANFORD (N. Y.): I do not want to abuse the courtesy of Comrade Brower, and therefore will make no remarks on the subject of the nomination, but I would like to say that no matter how much my tongue should speak I could not possibly express what is in my heart. This letter is from Comrade Debs, under date of May 4th. When I arrived in Chicago about a week or ten days before that time, I heard rumors that

Comrade Debs' health was very bad in the latter part of April. One of the first things I heard was that the health of Comrade Debs was very bad. I heard that his throat was so bad that he could not speak for two years. I also heard that he would not accept the nomination under any conditions. Under those circumstances I took it upon myself, not as a delegate to this convention, for I was not at that time elected, but I took it upon myself as a private member of the Socialist Party to write Comrade Debs a very clear, plain, explicit letter asking answers to three questions; first, as to the condition of his throat; second, as to the condition of his physical health generally; and third, as to whether he would accept the nomination of the party if it were tendered him. Comrade Debs answered those questions just as plainly as I put them, and I am going to read you his answer, which was sent me under date of May 4th. I might add that Comrade Stedman had an opportunity to read this letter some time ago:

"As to my throat and general health, I have improved considerably since I have had a chance to lead something like a regular life and get a reasonable amount of rest. I visited a specialist again a few months ago, and he assured me that my throat was greatly improved. At present I feel no ill effects. My general health is about all that could be desired. So far as strength is concerned, I never had more to my credit, if as much. In the coming campaign, however, I would prefer, if I had my choice, to see what I could do with my pen and give my tongue a rest. I feel as if I can write a campaign and make some of the enemy take notice that there are Socialists in the field. (Applause.) Now, I will tell you candidly just how I feel. I have never refused to do, so far as I could, anything the party commanded me to do, and never shall. I have taken the nomination under protest, but I have no desire to run for office and a positive prejudice against the very thought of holding office. To obey the commands of the Socialist party I violated a vow made years ago that I would never again be a candidate for political office. My

whole ambition—and I have a goodly stock of it—is to make myself as big and as useful as I can, as much opposed to the enemy and as much loved by our comrades as any other private in the ranks. You need have no fear that I shall shirk my part in the coming campaign. I shall be in condition, and I hope there will be no good ground for complaint when the fight is over. Very sincerely, Eugene V. Debs." (Applause.)

Second to Nomination of Simons.

DEL. BROWER (Ill.): Comrade Chairman and fellow delegates: I yield to no man in the Socialist Party in admiration for our comrade, Eugene V. Debs, but I do hope the Socialist Party, which expresses the solidarity and intelligence that is being organized in the face of the great social structure that shall bring to this country of ours a full-fledged democracy, as its organized expression and unfailing aim in the United States of America, can safely trust its banner in the hands of more than one man in this great party of ours. I want to second the nomination of another candidate. I have seen two campaigns, thoroughly magnificent. The last one especially was a good fight. The campaign of 1908 will be still better. I do not believe there is any argument offered by the supporters of our loved comrade, Eugene V. Debs, in the statement that we would be repudiating the things he stands for if we saw fit to nominate another candidate for president of the United States on this, our ticket. I believe earnestly and honestly that while you can compel Debs to take this place simply by commanding him to go on this ticket as candidate for president, that you may be compelling him to forfeit his life in the near future to meet your present day demands. I want to tell you people tonight, you delegates and the rest of the audience, that I haven't got anything of oratory to bear out this effort of mine. I am not a hero worshipper, and I cannot be led to change my mind by the waving of a banner or the shaking of a hat in the air. I want to tell you men and women tonight that the Socialist Party of America, this

expression of the great international struggle, does not depend upon this party's nominating any one or another of the candidates that may be offered tonight. I do believe also that in making a nomination here for a third consecutive time in the history of this party, the probabilities are that you will be losing a force that you will need in the struggle in the greater campaign of 1912. I do believe that there are enough men in the Socialist Party today, and let us hope within the next four years or eight, that we may be able to name for one of these positions at the head of the ticket. But there are enough men today in the party who have the ability, the courage, the intelligence and the command of this philosophy of ours, that we do not need to be narrowed down to any one candidate when it comes to nominating for president and vice president of the United States; not one or two. I want to second the nomination of A. M. Simons, a man who has given years of his life to this struggle for the upbuilding of the international Socialist movement in America. (Applause.)

Nomination of Carl D. Thompson.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): Comrade Chairman and comrades: It is my fate to do unpopular things. I did an unpopular thing fifteen years ago when I succeeded in getting Comrade Debs into the Socialist movement. I did an unpopular thing twelve years ago when I did my very best to start the old Social Democracy together with Comrade Debs. I again did a very unpopular thing by splitting that party at the time they stood for colonization. And about eight years ago, I was also very unpopular because I stood very aggressively for Eugene V. Debs as the presidential candidate of the united Socialist Party. And, comrades, I am going to do something unpopular again tonight.

Comrades, I love Eugene V. Debs probably as much as any man or woman here. I have slept with him in the same bed. I have eaten with him at the same table. We have drank from the same glass. We have worked faithfully together for the same movement for many years. Our names were coupled together for many years,

and I hope they will be coupled together in the future. Until about three years ago there were not in the Socialist movement any two men who were closer friends and comrades than Eugene V. Debs and Victor Berger. My personal friendship for Debs has not changed one iota. But stronger than my personal friendship is my devotion to the Socialist movement of America and to the International Socialist movement. (Applause.) The question tonight is not simply the goodness of Eugene V. Debs, but who is the best qualified banner bearer for our party in the year 1908, when everything is taken into consideration. If you nominate Eugene V. Debs I can promise you that we will try to get from 50,000 to 75,000 votes for him in the state of Wisconsin. (Applause.) If you nominate somebody else we will try to get the same vote. We will do our duty. You will hear from Milwaukee, Racine, Manitowoc, and elsewhere. (Applause.) This is no mere belief. We have made good in the past, and we will make good again. (Applause.) But, comrades, there is one thing to be considered. We do not want to be a one-man party. Now, as much as I love my friend, Gene—there is not any man whom I ever met in my life who can shake hands like Eugene V. Debs, not one (applause)—but we do not want to become a one-man party in the sense that the Democratic party is a Bryan party. Having grown up in this party, knowing many comrades individually and knowing the party collectively, I know we have a good many men who will make excellent candidates. I want to propose to you, comrades, a man whom I have known for the last eight years, who has been with us in Wisconsin for the last six years, a man who has been helping us to do things there—we are getting into the habit in Wisconsin of doing things there—and we want to keep on in that habit. We are doing some constructive work, which all of you will do everywhere within about four or six years. (Applause.) This movement is growing, and it is of great importance that the people everywhere should hear that we are not simply a party that knows how to criticize, but that we can do things ourselves better

than the other people, even under the capitalistic system. (Applause.)

Comrades, in Milwaukee, Wis., we had a prejudice against preachers. Years ago when I edited a daily Socialist paper, I thought it was a part of my duty to get a fall out of them every little while. (Laughter.) And I tried to do my duty well. (Laughter.) But we found that the preacher after all is a proletarian in nine cases out of ten, especially the protestant preacher. I personally have found among the preachers some of the cleanest, noblest men I have ever met in my life. (Applause.) I am personally an agnostic; everybody knows that.

If you have any Socialist ministers and they are like the Socialist ministers in Wisconsin, if you don't want them, send them to us; we want them there. (Applause.) One of the very best of them is the comrade I want to mention now. You all know him by reputation. He has been east and west. He has worked in Denver, and he has spoken in Jersey City. Everybody who heard him liked him; everybody who heard him found him a clean man, a brainy man and an honest, upright, conscientious man. He bears the title "Honorable" because he is a member of the legislature of Wisconsin. But he deserves the name Honorable because he is honorable from every standpoint—I name the Honorable Carl D. Thompson. (Applause.)

Second to Nomination of Debs.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): Comrade Chairman and comrades, if there is any one thing that I have never expected to do, it is either to make a nomination speech or to second the nomination of a candidate for president on the national or any other ticket, and if I had my own way I would not be here. It may be that I am conceited in thinking that there are some things that I can say that have not been said, but it seems to me, whether I shall say them or some others, there are some points that should be considered.

Some of us who tonight are so enthusiastic at the mention of the name of Eugene V. Debs are classed as hero worshippers, as men who believe in only one man being capable

of carrying the red banner of Socialism for you in this campaign. I am not sure that I believe in phrenology, but I remember on one occasion of dropping into one of those places for a joke, and have always remembered what the fellow said, "You have a head that is practical." And I am here tonight speaking for Debs, not because it is Debs, not because I am a hero worshipper, but because I think this is the time and the year; if ever we needed Eugene Debs, it is right now. (Applause.) This is not the time for idle phrases. This is no time to conceal the truth. This is the time for plain speaking, for in my judgment this is the most critical campaign that the Socialist Party of America has ever gone into.

Now, I want to say briefly one or two things. In the first place, I want to say that I like and respect Carl D. Thompson as much as any man can. While I respect him, yet I am opposed to his nomination here tonight. In the first place, why do I mention it? Because it is a minor consideration, because we all know that there are certain elements in the Socialist ranks and others outside of the Socialist ranks who are Socialist and yet not in the Socialist party, that are in opposition to the idea of nominating Comrade Thompson. Some of the feuds, some of the struggles, some of the fraternal battles, if I may use that term, are still fresh in the minds of the membership. I am not here to say who is at fault, and I do not care, but I do know that we want a man in this campaign who can rally the working class to the red banner of Socialism, and do it with all the enthusiasm that a man is capable of. That means that we must have a man that has had no part in any of these battles within the ranks. I know it is better not to say this, but this is the time for plain speaking.

In the second place—and this is the most important reason—if I lived in Wisconsin, and if I were a delegate on this floor, I would drop dead trying to stop the nomination of Carl D. Thompson. I will tell you why. Because, in my judgment, the greatest calamity that can happen to the state of Wisconsin is to take Carl D. Thompson out of the Senate where

the people have put him. Let him stay there and finish his work, and four years from now, if he is alive, we will be in a position to consider him instead of somebody else.

I want to tell you something else frankly. I am not here to beat around the bush. I am not here to draw lines between working men and intellectuals, but I want to look you in the eye. I want to tell you that when it comes to a pick between the intellectual, the preacher, the professor, and the working man, that man who is fresh from the ranks of the working class and who in his every day life is in actual contact with the work and the struggle, I am with that man that I think the more nearly represents the working class. (Applause.) And I want to tell you something else. It is no use dodging these things. The man that I second has not been mentioned in a caucus held this last week in Chicago. He needs no caucus to make him the man who will receive the suffrages of the delegates of this convention, and if any of my friends want proofs they can have them. I know it is not necessary.

To come to the point again, and important point. You have talked much about unity. I will tell you one way to make sure of unity, better than all the resolutions you can draw up. If there is any one man today in America that all factions of Socialists have a liking and respect for, whether they call themselves the Socialist Labor Party or the Socialist Party, it is this man Debs. (Applause.) If there is any one man that can command the respect and confidence of the A. F. of L. and the pure and simplers and at the same time of the industrialists, it is Eugene V. Debs.

One thing more and I am done. You may laugh, you may ridicule and sneer at the Hearst movement, but in my judgment, sneer as you may, you have it to face. That being the case, it is going to require the very strongest personalities we have in this movement at the head to rally the working class and fire them with enthusiasm. Look at it from the practical standpoint, and I say the longer you study it, the more you will agree with me. I have talked with Socialists the country over, and the longer

I study it, the more I see there is just one man this year for us, Eugene V. Debs. (Applause.)

Nomination of James F. Carey.

DEL. IDA CROUCH HAZLETT (Mont.):—Comrade Chairman and comrades, I realize that in coming before this convention I come under the disadvantage of belonging to an enslaved part of society. I also realize that on account of that very fact, in the nomination of the candidate that I shall name here, perhaps his chances will be lessened on account of being nominated by a woman. And so it is that I come here for something else than to refer to the difficulties under which I labor at the present time, but I believe a great principle is at stake here in the way the nominations are made at this Socialist convention of 1908, and I believe the comrades must have courage to go against what may be called the orthodox method that has prevailed in the American Socialist Party. To think that in the number of years that the American Socialist Party has been organized, a comrade cannot stand up here to name another candidate for the suffrages of those who are here this evening, without being hissed all over the hall, is a disgrace to the American Socialist movement. (Applause.) I look upon the one who dared to do it in the face of hissing, as a hero. We also, those of us who believe that every delegate on the floor of this convention has a right to have an opportunity to vote for a candidate that he chooses—we believe that we should be allowed to do so without having aspersions cast upon our honesty, which has already been done in sneering tones. We came with the intention not to force a candidate upon the attention of the convention, but desiring that an opportunity might be offered so that every delegate in this convention might express his own free will in regard to the candidates. And, my comrades, I will say, as another did who made a nomination for a presidential candidate as the standard bearer of the American Socialist Party here this evening, I will say that no matter who is the choice of this convention, I can say for Montana and every State here that I know of, that the final choice will receive

the unanimous approbation of the convention. But I also deplore the fact that comrades sneer at the division between the intellectuals and the proletarians in the nomination and choice of a standard bearer. But I stand here this evening to name a man that I hope you will not overlook because he was nominated by a woman. He would also be a hero to accept it, you know. (Applause.) It was not his fault, and you should not lay it up against him in the future. But I will say that in nominating this candidate, no one can accuse me of nominating a candidate for the so-called intellectuals. I stand here to name as a candidate for the suffrages and votes of this convention a representative man from the ranks of organized labor in the United States; a man who is known well and favorably to you all as an actual representative, as a working man in the ranks of those who do the world's work. I stand here to nominate as a candidate a man whose nomination will show the great body of organized labor throughout the country that the Socialist deserves the confidence and support of organized labor. I shall name the only candidate that has been named so far from the actual ranks of the working class. And so it is this evening, my friends, that I now place before you in nomination as the standard bearer of the Socialist party for 1908 the name of James F. Carey, of Haverhill, Mass. (Applause.) In placing the name of Comrade Carey before you I hope it will be distinctly understood that no aspersions are cast upon any other candidate. My admiration for Eugene V. Debs is as great as that of any man or woman here. Not only because of the enthusiasm, but because I realize what it means to American working class history; because I know the grand character of the man; I realize all this. When I place the name of James F. Carey before you I do so pre-eminently for this reason: we are approaching the most important campaign into which the working class of America has even been drawn. Organized labor is held in a position that was held by the organized labor of Great Britain seventy-five years ago. Our judges of the supreme and fed-

eral courts are handing down decisions similar to those handed down in England seventy-five years ago. We are approaching the dissolution of the organized working class of this country. We have the courts against us, we have the judges against us, we have the legislatures against us. The Socialist Party is still erect in America, the representative of the political aspect of organized labor. I have said here upon this floor before that instead of the Socialist party actually representing organized labor in this country, the working class of organized labor practically looks upon us with aversion in every State I know of in the United States with the exception of two States. In Great Britain the Socialist party failed to represent the interests of organized labor. The result was a new party formed by organized labor. We are on the verge of such a denouement ourselves, and unless we are able to attract organized labor in this campaign we are on the verge of a new party being formed, and our work will have to be done all over again. This time we set before the working class of this country candidates who can stand for fighting the injunction and every issue that has been thrust upon us by the capitalist class, meet it squarely upon its merits, show organized labor that we are fighting the injunction with them in the Socialist party, and it is for this reason that I ask your support of the candidacy of Comrade Carey. (Applause.)

Second to Nomination of Debs.

DEL. SLAYTON (Pa.): I am thoroughly aware that your patience is almost exhausted, and I am going to treat you to a favor that you have not witnessed so far tonight, the favor of exceeding brevity. (Applause.) I knew that would be appreciated. If I were going to build a house I would get what I considered the best mechanic to do the job, even if I had had that same mechanic a number of times. In fact, the oftener I had him the better. (Applause.) The oftener I would like to get him again, as long as he would do the job. Now, we have got a job on hand. Somebody said here a while ago we had the capitalists on the run. I am not so sure

of that, but I would like to be, and I don't know anybody on earth that can start them running more quickly and more effectively and run them faster than the Tall Sycamore from Indiana. (Applause.)

I remember, when I saw that Tall Sycamore with that long finger of his pointing over the audience and those eagle eyes looking over the faces, and that gaunt figure straightening up, I made up my mind that that was the fellow that we were trying to get, and when I saw that sort of crouching attitude and I looked at him, I said, "We have got a job to do and we need help to do it."

Somebody said something about not having timber. Oh, yes; we have. If I am a carpenter, you understand, I look out over a pile here and over a pile there, and I want my scantling to be good stuff. If I want the scantling that is on top I take it because it is the one I like best, and after that I take the next and the next. Now, here is a piece of scantling that I know to be good and strong. After awhile, if I am going to have the same kind of a job and see another scantling that looks as if it will serve, I will use the other scantling, and when I take Debs from the bunch it is just because it strikes my mind that he is the best one. Curious, ain't it? But it is so dog-goned practical. If Eugene Debs is the best, what is the use in taking another? You cannot find anybody else in America with that long finger. You cannot find anybody that will go across the stage like this (suiting the action to the word) and look you in the face like he can and make you wonder how in the name of goodness he did it.

So now, not to worry you any longer, I only say to you that that is the best scantling in the pile, so let us use it instead of one similar. We have none better, and if they are not, they ought never to be nominated. (Applause.)

Second to Nomination of Debs.

DEL. STRICKLAND: Indiana has not been heard upon this question, and we want to say a word just now to the comrades, and in what I am going to say, I am going to take the cue from the speaker that has

just presented the matter. We have a practical proposition. Comrade Debs is such a great loving soul, as the Indiana comrades all know, and if I had time I have a letter which I would like to read, but the hour is too late. It is a letter written me just before coming to the convention. Comrade Reynolds has it. I say to the comrades everywhere, not only in Indiana, because we have to say he belongs to the United States rather than to Indiana (applause)—the practical proposition is this: The comrades think so much of him that they take too good care of him while he is on the road. The practical thing to do is to pick out one of his friends who can go with him, receive all flowers, attend the receptions and speak on his behalf; not that he needs private secretaries, but we need somebody to take a part of the load off his shoulders. Some traveling companion comrade ought to go with him every day and nearly every hour of the trip, and then since he is needed everywhere, start him early and make one great tour of the United States. Don't have him traveling day and night; give him comparatively short hauls. You can hardly get him to go into a Pullman anyhow. (Laughter.) Give him a chance. Give him a chance to have short runs, as many as can be made in the daytime. Let his traveling companion see that he is put to bed, and put him to bed at night at the right time. Let him have his rest. If that is done he will make in 1908 the greatest campaign that the Socialist party has ever had. **Second to Nomination of Thompson.**

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): We, the Wisconsin comrades, are accustomed to thinking things over pretty carefully, and then making the plan, driving the stakes, digging the trenches, laying the stones and putting up the structure. We have done it. (Applause.) Now, it has been said that if Thompson is taken from the Wisconsin campaign it will cripple us. I am sorry you do not know us better than that. Why, listen. You do not understand that 12th Assembly District. You have forgotten about Melms; he does not live there, but he lives in the city and helps us to carry on these campaigns. You have forgotten that

Seidel lives in the ward just next to that. You have forgotten about Welch. You have forgotten about some of these other men. You do not know much about Milwaukee anyway, but we do, because we are there and know what we have got. So I will tell you what we have got for this year, whether or not Thompson receives your nomination. We can, and I expect that we will, put Comrade Victor Berger in the Assembly this year, and that is pretty good. (Applause.) When I say we can, I want you to understand it, and that he is one who is accustomed to counting the votes after they are cast. I know what I am talking about. (Applause.)

Now, let me talk a little about the carpenter business. A political party has no reason for existence excepting to get political power. Where do you want to point to prove that the Socialist movement of America is capable of getting and using wisely political power under conditions obtaining in American politics? Where do you want to point? We are modest. I will let you say.

A DELEGATE: Wisconsin!

DEL. GAYLORD: Not always, I hope; no. That is why I want Thompson on your presidential ticket. Here is a man who has stood face to face not merely in the courts where he was at a disadvantage, but in the committee rooms, and on the floor of the State Legislature—face to face with the attorneys of the railroads, and beat them out. (Applause.) And the story he has to tell of the two-armed labor organization is a story that has thrilled every man and woman that ever heard it. Haven't you heard it? Well, I am sorry for you. I have sat as he has made his speeches there in the assembly, and I count it a privilege. This is no hero-worship. I have been on the job with this fellow twelve years, more or less, and I know what kind of tools he uses, and I am trying to tell you. I have heard him ram a whole proposition back down their throats, and he has made them swallow it. (Applause.) I heard him drive them into a corner on the proposition of taking the bankrupt railroads that the United States government had put on their

feet and given back then to private ownership, and they shut up and simply voted him down, he and his comrades. He knows how to meet those people and tell the story of how to get political power and how to use it when you have got it. If they ask him, "What do you do," he will tell them what he has been given the privilege by the working class of doing on the floor of the State Legislature. (Applause.) That is a pretty good story to tell. And so I take great pleasure in seconding the nomination of Comrade Thompson. You understand why, now. We have been training men and women there, taking them and using them. We thought at first we could not spare him, but we looked around and we got others.

Now, this is my closing word as to why we want you to do it. We begin to feel that it is time that somewhere else outside of Milwaukee they should begin to rise up and threaten the possibility of a real political voting organization that represents the working class and can get and can use and is using and will use rightly and fairly and intelligently political power for the people who need it and who must find a way to get it.

DEL. TUTTLE (Wis.): I come from Wisconsin, but I am going to get on the outside.

NAT. SEC. BARNES: I want to call attention to the fact that a man has been standing here for three-quarters of an hour.

DEL. TUTTLE: I object to Wisconsin being recorded until he is heard from.

DEL. O. F. BRANSTETTER: I move that no further seconds to nominations be heard, and that if there are any other States desiring to place new names in nomination, they be given an opportunity to do so, and that thereafter we immediately proceed to take a ballot. (Seconded.)

DEL. TUTTLE: Wisconsin is for Debs.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is a motion before the house. Shall we hear from the comrade from Missouri? A motion has been made and seconded that we have no more seconds to nominations.

DEL. WILLIAMS (Minn.): One of the members of the Minnesota

delegation wishes to second the nomination of Comrade James Carey. I ask for a hearing for Comrade Kaplan for that purpose.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you want to speak to the motion? You are out of order if you do not speak.

DEL. DAN WHITE (Mass.): That is an absolutely unfair motion to make. Comrade Carey is from Massachusetts. His nomination has been sprung tonight on the Massachusetts delegation. I know not what his position is in the matter, but I say that my love of Comrade Carey is just as boundless as yours for Debs, and we would like to show our appreciation for Comrade Carey by seconding his nomination.

DEL. BRANSTETTER: It was not my intention, I assure the comrades from Massachusetts and the delegates to this convention, to deprive any man of any just right or privilege upon the floor of this convention. But it seemed that for a moment I forgot that there were one or more candidates who had already been nominated and had not already received a second; and with the consent of my second and the house I will move that those not having already received at least one second be allowed to receive such second, and further new nominations may also receive the privilege of one seconding speech, but that further speeches be not allowed beyond that time. (Seconded.) It is necessary that some time between now and morning we must come to a vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

(Question called for.)

DEL. CARR (Ill.): I wish to say what I am to say now, not upon the matter of the nominations, not for the comrade of whom I am in favor, but in justice to us all, and chiefly to him who may be nominated by this convention. This motion to cut off discussion upon this matter is certainly unsocialistic and unfair, and I hope that whoever might be nominated in a Socialist convention after the gag rule had been applied would have the honor as an honest man to decline. (Applause.) And I want to say this, I yield to no man in my admiration of Eugene Debs, and I believe if Eugene Debs were nominated by a

convention where gag rule was applied, he would decline the nomination. Let us be fair. We can finish this business tomorrow if we cannot do it tonight. (Voices, "No.") That is all right. Then let us stay till we are done and not try to put somebody out. I want to serve notice on this audience that there are a number of comrades who have a right on this floor, who want to speak, and they ought to be heard, and I hope therefore, that this motion will be defeated in the interest of fairness.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you favor the motion, let it be known by saying "Aye," contrary "No." The "Ayes" appear to have it.

A division was called for, and the vote by show of hands resulted in 125 for and 24 against.

Nomination of Max S. Hayes.

DEL. HOEHN (Mo.): Comrades, I do not want to make a nominating speech. I simply wish to make a nomination. I wish to put in nomination as our presidential candidate for the election of 1908 a man who is an honor and a credit to the Socialist party and to the entire American labor movement; who is an honor and a credit to the entire International Socialist movement. I take great pleasure in nominating Comrade Max Hayes, of Cleveland, Ohio. (Applause.)

Second to Nomination of Carey.

DEL. KAPLAN (Minn.): Mr. Chairman and Comrades: I think after all we have about made up our minds. We all know how we feel. I say frankly that according to the sentiments as expressed upon the floor of this convention, as well as according to the sentiments expressed in this gathering—and I assume that the comrades in the back of the hall are all comrades—it seems to be Eugene V. Debs. (Applause.) Wait a little. But we are here as delegates, delegated to a Socialist convention. We must recollect that as Socialists we are not expected to be swayed from principle to a person. (Applause.) Now, wait a moment. If there was not upon this floor of the convention presented to you the spectacle of well nigh unanimity in the nomination of Eugene Debs, I would not rise here to second the nomination of another

comrade. If the result, however, is that we cannot get Eugene V. Debs, then I say, and I believe I am speaking for Minnesota, so far as relates to the other candidates, I second the nomination of James F. Carey, of Massachusetts.

Second to Nomination of Thompson.

DEL. STROBELL (N. J.): Last year about this time I came to Chicago and attended a Socialist meeting in the Garrick Theatre. I heard there a speech which fired my enthusiasm for Socialism again. You know that for eleven years I have been in the Socialist movement. You know that I have heard pretty nearly all the speakers. This speaker whom I heard was not any more eloquent than a good many speakers in the Socialist movement, and he was not any more sincere than many others in the Socialist movement. But this man had been through the mill; this man gave me new enthusiasm because of the story he had to tell of victories won, of triumphs won, of battles waged in the Legislature of his State.

A DELEGATE: A point of order. The comrade is seconding the nomination of Comrade Thompson.

DEL. TUTTLE: If he does, then I want my place on that platform.

THE CHAIRMAN: For what purpose did you rise?

DEL. STROBELL: To second the nomination of Thompson.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are out of order. The nomination was seconded by Comrade Gaylord.

DEL. STROBELL: I thought I had a right to second it, too.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have not, under the rule.

DEL. O'HARE: I move to reconsider and suspend the rule and hear Strobell. (Seconded.)

DEL. ANDERSON (N. Dak.): The chair has no right to suspend the rule.

THE CHAIRMAN: It ought to be evident to anyone that when a motion carries by a vote of 125 to 25 there is no one trying to apply the gag rule that has been intimated by the comrade in this side of the house. (Applause.) A motion has been made to reconsider and been seconded. If you reconsider that motion say "Aye," contrary "No." The motion is not reconsidered.

A vote on the candidates was called for.

DEL. VOSS (Tenn.): I move that all nominations be closed and that we proceed to vote. (Seconded.)

DEL. STRICKLAND: I move that the tellers wait upon us with ballots.

DEL. CARR (Ill.) Mr. Chairman—THE CHAIRMAN: Do you rise to make a nomination?

DEL. CARR: The motion I want to make is perfectly proper. It is past midnight. We do not want to see a thing like this in a Socialist convention. I will not support a thing like this, no matter who does. I move to adjourn.

The motion to adjourn was seconded, but was lost.

Second to Nomination of Hayes.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT (Wash.): Only in common courtesy, and because the Washington delegation has considered the name of Comrade Hayes as a presidential nominee, and has considered the name of Comrade Debs as well, I wish to second the nomination of Comrade Hayes. He can decline, if he wishes, of course.

DEL. PEISER (N. Y.): I move that we now proceed to vote on the presidential candidates and that the vote should be by roll-call by States. (Seconded.)

DEL. SOLOMON (N. Y.): I move an amendment, to make the roll-call by delegates instead of by States.

DEL. PEISER: I will accept the amendment.

DEL. STRICKLAND: I object. The motion was carried.

Hayes Declines.

DEL. COWAN (Ohio): I would like, in behalf of the Ohio delegation and Comrade Hayes, to withdraw the name of Comrade Hayes.

DEL. POPE (Mo.): I rise to a point of order: that no man that has been placed in nomination by the Socialist party has got a right to decline.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point of order is not well taken.

Carey Declines.

DEL. DAN WHITE (Mass.): In behalf of the Massachusetts delegation, the name of James F. Carey is withdrawn.

DEL. IDA CROUCH HAZLETT: Massachusetts has no right to with-

draw that, unless Carey authorizes it.

DEL. DAN WHITE: Today I said to Comrade Carey there was some sort of effort to make him a candidate against Debs, and he said that if he was nominated he wished to withdraw his name, and this is the reason I take this liberty.

DEL. HAZLETT: Let him stand like a man and give us a chance to vote.

ASST. SEC. STRICKLAND: The names that stand will be Debs. Simons and Thompson.

ROLL-CALL ON PRESIDENT.

A roll-call by delegates was then taken, with the following result:

FOR DEBS:—ALA., Freeman, Waldhorst; ARK., Hogan, Perrin, Penrose, Le Fevre, Snow; ARIZ., Cannon, Morrison; CAL., Bradford, McDevitt, Wheat, Woodby, Tuck, Cole, Merrill, Osborne, Johns, McKee, Bauer, Starkweather; COLO., Buie, Maynard, Miller; CONN., Schiedge, Smith; DEL., Hench; GA., Wilke; ILL., Collins, Fraenckel, Knopfnagel, Morgan, Kerr, A. M. Simons, Korngold; IND., Strickland, Reynolds, Dunbar, Kunath; IA., Rohrer, Hills; KAN., Wilson, Snyder, McAllister, Brewer, Katterfeld; MD., Lewis, Toole; MASS., Konikow, Dan White, Eliot, White, Mahoney, Putney, D'Orsay, Cutting, Fenton; MICH., Menton, Hittunen; MINN., Peach, Kaplan, Thorsett, Ingalls, Anderson, Macki; MO., Garver, Pope, Callery; NEV., Miller; N. H., Wilkins, Arnstein; N. J., Goebel, Kearns, Killingbeck, Reilly; N. Y., Solomon, Wanhope, Hillquit, Lee, Lewis, Slobodin, Paulitsch, Fieldman, Hanford, Gerber, Furman, Vander Porten, Peiser, Spargo, Cole, Strebel, Fuhrman, Klenke; N. C., Quantz; N. D., Lampman, Anderson; OHIO, Prevey, Cowan, Bandler, Vautrim, Jones, Ziegler, Hayes, Devine; OKLA., Hagel, O. F. Branstetter, Edwards, Dome, Block, Reynolds, Boylan, Wills, O'Hare; ORE., Varner, Ryan, Barzee, Crabtree, Ramp; PA., Adams, Clark, J. E. Cohen, G. N. Cohen, Davies, Foley, Maurer, Moore, Ringler, Slayton, Schwartz, Young, Goaziou; TENN., Voss; TEX., McFadin, Holman, Bell, Payne, Clark, Smith, Buchanan,

Rhodes, Thompson; UTAH, Syphers, Leggett; VA., Dennett; WASH., Herman, Hendrickson, Brown, Wagenknecht, Krueger, Downie, Boomer, Martin; W. VA., Houston; WIS., Tuttle; WYO., O'Neill, Ryckman.

FOR CAREY:—ILL., Berlyn; LA., Hymes; MAINE, Pelsey; MINN., Maattala, Williams; MO., Hoehn, Brandt, Behrens, Lipscomb; MONT., Graham, Hazlett, Wesleder, Ambrose, Peura, Harvey, Powers.

FOR THOMPSON:—ILL., Carr; IOWA, Brown; NEB., Porter, N. J., Krafft, Strobell; N. Y., Hunter; WIS., Gaylord, Weber, Thomas, Melms, Berger, Heath, Sandburg, Jacobs.

FOR SIMONS:—COLO., Floaten; IDA., Rigg, Chenoweth; ILL., Bentall, Brower, Lewis, Stedman; IA., Work; WIS., Thompson.

ABSENT:—ARK., Jones; FLA., Pettigrew; IDA., Untermann; ILL., Hunt, May Wood Simons, Walker; IA., Shank; KY., Seeds; MASS., Carey, Hitchcock; MICH., Lockwood, Stirtor; MINN., Rose, Nieminen; N. M., Metcalf; OHIO, Rodgers; S. D., Atwood, Knowles; VT., Wilson; WYO., Groesbeck.

Total Vote Cast, 198. For Debs, 159. For Carey, 16. For Thompson, 14. For Simons, 9.

DEL. BERGER: I believe I express the unanimous wish of my comrades from Wisconsin and outside, and I would move to make the nomination of Comrade Eugene V. Debs unanimous.

DEL. STEDMAN: I would like to second the motion on behalf of Comrade Simons and the comrades nominating him.

The motion to make the nomination unanimous was carried.

DEL. HILLQUIT: I now move that this convention instruct the Secretary to send a telegram to the presidential nominee, inviting him to appear at this convention as soon as possible, and at any rate, before we adjourn.

The motion was seconded and carried.

A motion to adjourn was made and lost.

NOMINATION OF CANDIDATE FOR VICE-PRESIDENT.

The convention then proceeded to the selection of a candidate for Vice-President.

Nomination of Benjamin Hanford.

DEL. BANDLOW (Ohio): Having topped our work with the magnificent nomination of Eugene V. Debs, next in order is to give him a running mate that will be a credit, and so I place in nomination for Vice-President the name of Benjamin Hanford of New York. (Applause.)

Nomination of Caleb Lipscomb.

DEL. POPE (Mo.): Comrades and friends, there is no man in the Socialist movement that recognizes the laboring man in this great campaign more than I do. But I want to say to you that I come here this evening to represent the other great army, that thing that we must win if ever we win the battle of freedom. I come to you this evening—and it has all come to me since I came to this Convention—I have been studying and watching this great movement, and I heard the cry go up here—why, you have heard the leaders of this great movement tell you that there is a class of people that you must get into this great movement before you can win. And tonight I want to nominate one who represents that class; that talks in their language; that knows them and knows how they live, and knows how to make a campaign among those men. The men that I represent and want to get into the minds and hearts of these delegates are the men that rise at dawn of day and labor till the sun goes down. I want to nominate a man who will go before those people and will gather them into the Socialist movement. Where, in the name of common sense and reason, did you ever hear of a man being nominated that represented the farmers of this country? Comrades, we do not ever hear of any party in the United States going to the farming class and saying to them, "We recognize that you are the backbone of this country. If it were not for the farmers, the mills and the mines and the factories could not exist." I want to say to you that I come to advocate the farmers' cause. Let me

say this: To my mind this great movement will see in the future a great army of men coming into the Socialist Party, and that great army of men is going to come from the farmers of this country. I want to warn the industrial centers of this: Unless they rise and awake, the farmers will control the next Convention of the Socialist Party. (Applause.) I want here and now to place in nomination a man who recognizes that other great class that we have got to have. When I nominate that man, he will be from old Missouri and he will "show them." I nominate the grand old comrade, Caleb Lipscomb, of the State of Missouri. (Applause.)

Second to Nomination of Hanford.

DEL. MILLER (Colo.): I rise to second the nomination of a man whom you all know, and well; one who is able to carry the banner of Socialism alongside that of our gallant standard bearer. Something like 26 years ago this man left the rural districts to cast his lot in life in the great industrial centers of the country. From that time on down to the present, his hands, his heart, and his soul have been in the cause of organized labor. Back there in the dim ages of the past, when the only language of the working class was a groan, he had caught that groan, and, ah, in what eloquent speech it falls from his lips as an indictment against the ruling class. There is no man in this country better able to draw an indictment against capitalism. I think sometimes we overdo the matter in decrying the individual. This man's mind is as wide as the plains of our great country, his heart is as wide as human sympathy and human need, and his thought like the starry dome above. To know that man is to love him—an inspiration and a joy. There will be thousands of men, when this man's name is placed upon our standard by the side of that of Eugene Debs, who will say, "I do not know a great deal about Socialism, but I know that man fights and I know his heart. I believe in the man so much that I am willing to walk beneath the banner that he bears aloft." I second the nomination of New York's favorite son, Benjamin Hanford. (Applause.)

Nomination of James F. Carey.

DEL. WILLIAMS (Minn.): I wish

to place in nomination a comrade for Vice-President. Some years ago I had occasion to take a little trip up on the coast of Massachusetts and there in one of the cities of that Bay State I met a comrade whom I found to have purely proletarian working-class aspirations and habits and customs from his childhood up. I found a man who scarcely ever had a cent in his pocket, because in the goodness of his heart he could never save a cent, even though he made good wages. I found a comrade who was respected and honored by the Socialists from one end of the country to the other—a man who as a proletarian in the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts was for five years the terror of the parliamentarians of the capitalist class; a man who served as the first common councillor elected on a Socialist ticket in the United States. I present the name of Comrade James F. Carey. (Applause.)

Nomination of J. W. Slayton.

DEL. RYAN (Ore.): Coming from the Far West, I wish to place in nomination a man of the Far East; a man who is familiar with the mining industries; who has been in the labor unions; who will carry the vote of the Western farmer as a candidate to run with Eugene V. Debs on the ticket for the nomination of the Vice-Presidency, with Eugene V. Debs at the head of the ticket. I am no orator nor much of a speaker on this question, but I want to place in nomination the name of J. W. Slayton of Pennsylvania. (Applause.)

Second to Nomination of Carey.

DEL. GRAHAM (Mont.): On behalf of the Montana delegation in this Convention, I second the nomination of Carey.

Second to Nomination of Hanford.

DEL. LEWIS (Ill.): I do not want to make a speech; this is no time for speech making. But I wish it to go into the record of this Convention that I may register my opinion that so far as I am concerned I owe more to the man who has been nominated for this position than to any other man in the United States. For the hand of comradeship, for the stimulating example, for the encouragement wherever I met him in this

country, and I met him east and west and in the Middle States, I owe a personal debt. As a Socialist speaker getting tired and weary, I received through the mails long letters of seven and eight pages from one who was in a condition of health at that time that I knew it cost him pain and sometimes probably agony to write a few lines, but because I needed to be encouraged in working for the progress of Socialism, this man consented to do this work; and I have felt since I first met him in the city of San Francisco when he addressed an audience seven times this size, that this man of all others is my candidate and that the candidate on our ticket should be our comrade from New York, Ben Hanford. (Applause.)

Nomination of Seymour Stedman.

DEL. THOMPSON (Wis.): I rise to place in nomination one of the men who were the founders of the present Socialist Party. We have now chosen for a standard bearer at the head of this ticket a man who is the terror of the capitalists and who represents the working class and also the trade union movement. I think it would not at all be out of place if we should put in nomination for the second place a man who traces his membership to the very beginnings of this party and has been putting his time and means and heart into it from that time to the present moment. I nominate Seymour Stedman, of Chicago. (Applause.)

Nomination of May Wood Simons.

DEL. FREEMAN (Ala.): I was in hopes that the nomination of Comrade Ben Hanford would have been perfectly unanimous, and to my mind I think it will be practically unanimous. But since other names have been offered here this evening, I have the same right to offer a name that, if you do not consider tonight, you will consider some time during the next four years, and I hope that the party of America will have so far progressed in four years from now that it will be able to accept the name that I now present to you. I rise to nominate for Vice-President a comrade whose devotion to our cause is well known; who has culture and learning; who is a graduate of one of the greatest universities of the country; who

has knowledge of the philosophy of Socialism; whose standing as a student of the whole world is acknowledged; whose talent and ability as an exponent of the working class issues and political action are known throughout the International movement; who has the love and confidence of the American movement, and who should be nominated for Vice-President of the United States, May Wood Simons of Illinois. (Great applause.)

Second to Nomination of Stedman.

DEL. KORNGOLD (Ill.): I rise to second the nomination of Comrade Stedman. I think we cannot have a braver comrade, a comrade who understands the philosophy of Socialism better and who can present it in a fitter way than Seymour Stedman. (Applause.)

Nomination of G. W. Woodby.

DEL. JONES (Ohio): Comrades of the Convention, the nomination that I want to make for our Vice-President on this ticket should, I believe, receive the careful consideration of the Convention. The man whom I am to nominate is a man who is well known in the movement and has been in the movement for many years. The Socialist Party is a party that does not recognize race prejudice, and in order that we may attest this to the world, I offer the name of Comrade Woodby of California. (Applause.)

Second to the Nomination of Slayton.

DEL. HOLMAN (Tex.): Comrades, I rise to second the nomination of a running mate for Eugene V. Debs. Before I call attention to his running mate I wish to first call attention to the fact that when Eugene V. Debs' name is mentioned in my presence I too have felt the cold steel of the prison bars on my cheeks as Debs did at the Wodstock jail, and in the same cause for which Debs went there. I want to nominate a man that from his reputation will be a credit not only to the Socialist movement, but to Eugene V. Debs also. That man, near to me, is a tradesman of mine; he is the carpenter of Pittsburgh, Pa., J. W. Slayton. (Applause.)

Carey Declines.

DEL. MAHONEY (Mass.): The Massachusetts delegation desire to extend their thanks to the Minnesota and Montana delegates for the nomi-

nation of Carey, but I desire at the present time to withdraw his name as a candidate for Vice-President. We have his absolute consent to withdraw his name.

Lipscomb also declined.

The names of Delegates Carey and Lipscomb having been withdrawn, a roll call was taken on the names of Delegates Hanford, Slayton, May Wood Simons, Stedman and Woodby.

The roll-call resulted as follows:

For Hanford: ARK., Hogan, Le Fevre; CAL., McDevitt, Woodby; COL., Buie, Maynard, Miller; DEL., Henck; GA., Wilke; ILL., Lewis, Morgan, Kerr; IND., Strickland, Reynolds, Dunbar, Kunath; KAN., Snyder, Brewer; MASS., Dan White, Eliot White, Mahoney, Putney, D'Orsay, Cutting, Fenton; MICH., Menton, Hittunen; MO., Brandt; Behrens, Callery, Lipscomb; NEV., Miller; N. H., Wilkins, Arnstein; N. J., Goebel, Kearns, Killingbeck, Krafft, Reilly; N. Y., Solomon, Wanhope, Hillquit, Lee, Lewis, Slobodin, Paulitsch, Fieldman, Hunter, Gerber, Furman, Vander Porten, Peiser, Spargo, Cole, Strebel, Fuhrman, Klenke; N. C., Quantz; N. D., Anderson; O., Prevey, Cowan, Bandlow, Ziegler, Hayes, Devine; OKLA., Hagel, O. F. Branstetter, Ross, Davis, Edwards, Dome, Block, Boylan, Wills, O'Hare; PA., Clark, J. E. Cohen, G. N. Cohen, Davies, Maurer, Moore, Schwartz, Young; R. I., Hurst; TEX., McFadin, Holman, Bell, Payne, Clark, Smith, Buchanan, Rhodes, Thompson; UTAH, Syphers, Leggett; VA., Dennett; WASH., Herman, Brown, Wagenknecht, Krueger, Downie, Boomer, Martin; W. VA., Houston; WIS., Weber, Tuttle.

For Stedman: ALA., Waldhorst; CAL., Bradford, Wheat, Cole, McKee, Starkweather; COL., Floaten; IDA., Rigg, Chenoweth; ILL., Berlyn, Brower, Korngold, Carr, Simons; IA., Brown, Work, Hills; MINN., Kaplan,

Thorsett, Ingalls, Williams, Anderson; MO., Garver, Hoehn; MONT., Graham, Hazlett, Wesleder, Ambrose, Peura, Harvey, Powers; NEB., Porter; N. J., Strobell; TENN., Voss; WIS., Gaylord, Thomas, Melms, Berger, Thompson, Heath, Sandburg, Jacobs.

For May Wood Simons: ALA., Freeman; ARK., Perrin, Penrose, Show; ILL., Collins, Bentall, Knopfnagel; IA., Rohrer; KAN., Wilson, McAllister; LA., Hymes; ME., Pelsey; MD., Lewis, Toole; MASS., Konikow; MINN., Maattala, Macki; O., Vautrim; OKLA., Winnie E. Branstetter; PA., Goaziou.

For Slayton: ARIZ., Cannon, Morrison; CAL., Tuck, Osborne, Johns, Bauer; ILL., Stedman; KAN., Katterfeld; ORE., Ryan, Barzee, Ramp; PA., Adams, Foley, Ringler; WYO., O'Neill.

For Lipscomb: MO., Pope.

For Woodby: O., Jones.

Absent: CAL., Merrill; CONN., Schieldge, Smith; FLA., Pettigrew; IDA., Untermann; ILL., Fraenckel, May Wood Simons; IA., Shank; KY., Seeds; MASS., Carey, Hitchcock; MICH., Lockwood, Stirton; MINN., Rose, Peach, Nieminen; N. M., Metcalf; N. D., Lampman; O., Rodgers; OKLA., Reynolds; ORE., Varner; Crabtree; S. D., Atwood, Knowles; VT., Wilson; WYO., Groesbeck, Ryckman.

Not Voting: N. Y., Hanford; PA., Slayton.

Total vote cast, 185.

For Hanford	106
For Stedman	42
For May Wood Simons	20
For Slayton	15
For Lipscomb	1
For Woodby	1

Delegates Slayton, Stedman and Kearns united in moving to make the nomination of Hanford unanimous, and it was carried.

The Convention then at 1:58 a. m. adjourned until 10 o'clock a. m.

SIXTH DAY'S SESSION

The convention was called to order at 10 o'clock by Asst. Secretary Strickland.

ASST. SEC. STRICKLAND: I have a resolution here from New York in favor of unity, bearing the seal of the Socialist Party Unity League. This matter has been disposed of in the convention.

DEL. GERBER (N. Y.): I do not know that there is anything like a Socialist Party Unity League in the city of New York. Hence, this communication comes from the outside of the party entirely. I move that it be laid on the table.

ASST. SEC. STRICKLAND: It is moved that this message be laid upon the table. Those in favor will say aye. The ayes have it and the matter is laid upon the table.

Del. Bandlow, of Ohio, was elected chairman for the day.

THE CHAIRMAN: The convention adjourned last evening after the nominations were completed, pending the further consideration of the report on Platform. The report of the Committee on Platform therefore is the first order of business this morning, and unless otherwise ordered by the convention, that committee has the floor.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PLATFORM RESUMED.

DEL. A. M. SIMON (Ill.), reporting for the Platform Committee: I will now read the Program:

"As measures calculated to strengthen the power of the working class in its fights for the realization of its ultimate aim, and to increase its power of resistance against capitalist oppression, we advocate and pledge ourselves and our elected officers to the following program:

"1. The national ownership of railroads, telegraphs, telephones, steamships and all other means of transportation and communication.

"2. The national ownership of all industries which are organized on a national scale and in which competition has virtually ceased to exist.

"3. The extension of the public domain to include mines, quarries, oil wells, forests and waterpower.

"4. The scientific re-forestation of timber lands and the reclamation of swamp land, lands so re-forested or reclaimed to be permanently reclaimed as part of the public domain.

"5. The absolute freedom of press, speech and assemblage, as guaranteed by the constitution.

"6. That religion be treated as a private matter, a question of individual conscience.

"7. The improvement of the industrial conditions of the workers:

"(a) By shortening the work day in keeping with the increased productivity of machinery;

"(b) By securing to every worker a rest period of not less than a day and a half in each week;

"(c) By securing a more vigorous inspection of workshops and factories;

"(d) By forbidding the employment of children under sixteen years of age;

"(e) By forbidding the interstate transportation of the products of child labor, of convict labor, and of all uninspected factories;

"(f) By abolishing official charity and substituting in its place compulsory insurance against unemployment, illness, accidents invalidism, old age and death.

"8. The extension of inheritance taxes graduated in proportion to the amount of the bequests and to the nearness of kin.

"9. A graduated income tax.

"10. Unrestricted and equal suffrage for men and women, and we pledge ourselves to engage in an active campaign in that direction.

"11. The initiative and referendum,

proportional representation, and the right of recall.

"12. The abolition of the Senate.

"13. The abolition of the veto power of the President.

"14. That the constitution be made amendable by majority vote.

"15. Government by majority. In all elections where no candidate receives a majority, the result should be determined by a second ballot.

"16. The enactment of further measures for general education and for the conservation of health.

"17. The elevation of the present bureau of education into a department, and the creation of a department of public health.

"18. The separation of the present bureau of labor from the Department of Commerce and Labor and its elevation to the rank of a department.

"19. That all judges be elected for short terms, and that the power to issue injunctions should be curbed by immediate legislation.

"20. The free administration of justice."

Then there was another section which was taken from our last year's platform: "Such measures of relief as we may be able to force from capitalism are but a preparation of the workers to seize the whole power of government, in order that they may thereby lay hold of the whole system of industry, and thus come into their rightful inheritance."

Now I will proceed to read seriatim.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection, we will take up this part of the platform section by section.

DEL FIELDMAN (N. Y.): I have an amendment to offer. It is generally admitted, even by the capitalist class, that we are now in the midst of a crisis, far the worst industrial crisis that the American people have ever passed through. Something can and must be done right now, and if this convention adjourns without including some plan, particularly in the general program, that deals concretely with the issue and necessity of the minute and the hour we shall not have done our duty to the working class of this country.

If you look over this platform you will find not a single immediate demand. The program is divided into general demands, under the headings of industrial

demands and political demands, and that ends it.

Now, we need an immediate demand under a separate head, that should be included in the program, and I wish to present to you such an immediate demand. I want to say in justice to a comrade who is a lone delegate from one of the smallest states in the Union. I want to say that Comrade Fred Hurst of Rhode Island is the author of this, and with slight changes I have undertaken to bring the matter before you and present it to your careful attention. It deserves your undivided attention and consideration. This demand is already seconded by a delegate from Massachusetts. The title of this immediate demand is: An immediate demand for the employment of unemployed labor. It reads:

"The government shall employ every willing worker, their hours and wages to harmonize with the scale established by organized labor for similar work. Our government, by the right of eminent domain, shall take over such property as may seem necessary to promote the general welfare, build, equip and operate railroads, now the post roads, mines, factories, and provide any other useful work sufficient from time to time to employ all who need and apply for work; that all work be paid for by the day, and no work be let out under private contract; that all money needed to put into effect the foregoing, with all accessories needful for their successful operation, be provided by Congress in harmony with the United States constitution, which reads (Article I, Sec. 8): 'Congress shall have power to coin money and to regulate the value thereof.' All money issued for this purpose shall be full legal tender and paid by the national, state and municipal governments direct to the workers for services rendered. The national government to extend credit to the states and municipalities at cost. The marketable products to be sold to consumers at the cost of production and distribution, and that the price to the public for services be practically the cost of maintaining and operating the same."

I move the adoption of that as a separate plank in our general program, and that it be the very first plank under the heading, "Immediate Demand for the

Employment of Unemployed Labor." I wish the floor to speak to my motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: I ask the indulgence of the convention to have read the telegram to Eugene V. Debs.

ASST. SEC. STRICKLAND: This is the telegram that was ordered last night, and is signed by the secretary, as directed by the convention last night.

"Eugene V. Debs,

"Girard, Kansas.

"Your comrades in convention assembled have this night, by unanimous vote and with old-time enthusiasm, nominated you for the presidency. I am instructed to express to you their appreciation of your magnificent services in the cause of the exploited workers. We pledge you our every support and our devoted co-operation. Hanford will run with you. Come without delay, at once, that we may all see you and hear you, and shake your hand before the convention adjourns.

(Signed) "FREDERIC HEATH,
"Sec'y Socialist Convention."

Del. Fieldman's amendment was declared out of order.

DEL. SIMONS (reading): First: National ownership of railroads, telegraphs, telephones, steamships and all other means of transportation and communication."

I move the adoption of that plank.

DEL. FURMAN (N. Y.): I move you that before railroads are mentioned in this separate plank that there be inserted the words "all the land." The land is just as necessary as machinery, railroads, telegraphs and everything else.

The motion was seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded that there be added the words "all the land."

DEL. THOMPSON: There is a provision for the ownership of the land later on.

DEL. WILKE (Ga.): I move that the word "public" be substituted for "national."

DEL. WORK (Iowa): Is the motion to insert "all the land" before the house?

THE CHAIRMAN: It is.

DEL. WORK: Then I want to speak against it. We surely do not propose to put into this platform a declaration in favor of the public ownership of land that is used by people who are living on it themselves. If we do that we declare for public ownership of every bit of

land in the whole country. We decided yesterday that the Socialist Party only wants collective ownership of those things which are used for exploitation. When land is used by the person who lives on it, it is not used for exploitation and does not need to be collectively owned."

DEL. JOHNS (Cal.): I am opposed to the amendment. If we adopt anything of this kind we should have an illustrative preamble showing what we mean and what this means to the working class. It might be done by citing the example of such work in Japan, showing the wonderful advantages to the working class of government ownership. There the railroads with a few exceptions are government owned. All the telegraph and telephone lines and the cigar manufacturing industry are government owned.

I don't think I need to tell you who were so terrified a day or two ago lest the Japs might bring our standard of living down that the working class in Japan is not living in luxury as a result of the government ownership in Japan. This would look very pretty in a reform platform. William—also Randolph—Hearst will see that there are slathers of that sort of thing in the platform of his independent party. I saw it stated in the paper that the Democratic party had stolen a plank from the Socialist platform.

A DELEGATE: That is true.

DEL. JOHNS: Well, it belonged in the Democratic platform and therefore it went there, and should not have been in the Socialist platform at all. Let us leave it to them to put those things in. In all these planks and the other planks that are suggested, the ghosts of dead parties rise before us in this convention, and if we don't want our poor ghosts wandering around we have got to put in our platform things which the capitalist party will not steal and dare not steal.

DEL. CLARK (Tex.): It appears to me from the statements made by Comrade Work that the collective ownership of land is not a part of Socialism. He made the statement, if I mistake not, that land is not a means of exploitation. That was the statement made by Comrade Work—

DEL. WORK: My statement is that when land is used by its possessor and

occupier alone it is not used for exploitation, when he does the work upon it. We only want collective ownership of such land as is used for exploitation.

DEL. CLARK: In the main I agree with Comrade Work, but it is evident the convention has got it into its mind that we do not stand for public ownership of the entire means of production and distribution. I am a revolutionist, and as such I stand for the collective ownership of the entire means of production and distribution. Just so long as we leave in the hands of the exploiting class, the class which exploits the working class, one penny that they produce, just so long we are in no position to say that the Democrats or the Hearst people are making different demands from us. I repeat again that I stand for collective ownership, not of the larger part of the land, but collective ownership of the entire earth. If we begin to compromise with the capitalist class, there is no way that we who believe in the collective ownership of the earth can present the principles of the Socialist Party which the majority of the working class of America, who are already disinherited, would listen to. I know that you are going to make fine distinctions. When the immediate demands were introduced I stood against every demand. I stood for revolution. I know you are going to say when you follow me that I am an impostor, that I say if you go along the lines you propose you will not reach the co-operative commonwealth, the ideal for which we stand, until the earth shall be no more. There is no doubt that the steps we are taking in this convention as to an immediate demand have a strong tendency to lead us to state capitalism in industrial government. I say now I don't want to be mistaken. I don't believe in a political state. I believe in government being organized along industrial lines, and that the political state must give way to the industrial commonwealth. Just so long as we have political government, just so long shall we have political despotism. Politics will creep in. You may say that he believes in democracy. I say that if the capitalist state has been used in the perpetuation of private property, the only way we can get what we are after is to constantly work for the co-opera-

tive commonwealth based on industrial lines.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): Politics is no more essentially and inherently corrupt than a machine is essentially and inherently corrupt, because it is used now for the exploitation of the working class, any more than land is essentially and inherently corrupt because it is used for the exploitation of the working class. It all depends upon whose hands the political power is placed in. The same political power that is used now corruptly for the purpose of exploiting the working class becomes a weapon for the liberation of the working class and for overthrowing the corruption of politics in the present state. In some points I agree with the previous speakers. When you adopted your platform, you said you wanted collective ownership of the means of production and distribution that are used for exploitation. You adopted that with a whoop and now it comes back to you and you are considering it. You cannot reject in your program what you have adopted in your platform. That means that if a capitalist owns three miles or a big corporation owns ten miles, and it is not used for exploitation that we don't want it to be owned collectively. If you say that the farmer owns his little farm, which he does not own for exploitation except from his wife and children, you say the Socialist party does not concern itself with that. The farmer is an exploiter of his wife and children. But you say because the farmer does not use that land for exploitation generally, it is not to be owned collectively. I say the Socialist movement of the world stands for collective ownership of all the means of production and distribution. We should not make any fine distinction. I do not care whether you declare in the program or in the preamble, or in the demand—I say if you strike it out in the program, you must strike it out in the demand and the preamble.

DEL. THOMPSON (Wis.): Let us try to look carefully at this matter. I hold in my hand the platform of the Social Democratic party of Germany; the platforms of the Socialist parties of Austria, of Belgium, of France, the Independent Labor party of England, together with the speeches of the great

men of the Socialist movement of the world.

It has been said on this floor that the Socialist party stands for certain things the world over, but let us look at the actual program and find out what they stand for. The proposition here is that the Socialist party must stand for the collective ownership of every and all means of production and distribution.

It has been said that the Socialist party cannot stand for the proposition that the small farmer shall be allowed to retain possession of the farm land. I want to stop long enough to give you the actual words of those leaders of the Socialist movement.

Every Socialist party in the world stands for immediate demands, and if you will read the platforms of these Socialist parties of the world you will see that is true.

Where does the International Socialist movement stand on the land question? In Germany the comrades at their congress appointed three different committees to study the question of agriculture with reference to Socialism, and on these committees they have placed the best men of the Social Democracy of Germany, and at Stuttgart they brought in their report.

Here are such men as Liebknecht, and Bebel and the other great leaders of Germany. What is their position on this? Must we stand here and say to the farmer that we propose to have the collective ownership of every little bit of land no matter how much it is? I say no. I say the Socialist party does not stand for that at the present time anywhere in the world.

DEL. CLARK (Tex.): Do you believe in a private title to land?

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrade Thompson has the floor.

DEL. CLARKE: May I ask you a question? Do you believe in a private title for land, or do you believe their possession and occupancy shall determine the title?

DEL. THOMPSON: I am trying to explain to the convention the international position on this question.

DEL. CLARK: That is dodging the issue.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you please be in order? I want to say that discussions between the speaker and other

delegates who wish to ask questions is not provided for in the rules.

DEL. THOMPSON: The comrades are asking for the words of these leaders. Kautsky says the little farm industry may well remain private property. Kautsky further says as yet no Socialist who is to be taken seriously has ever demanded that the farmer should be expropriated.

Vandervelde of Belgium says, and the great leaders of Socialism agree in saying that there is no ground for bringing pressure to make the peasant form of property come into the collective domain.

Jaures says that Socialists have never expected to force the present farm property into communistic ownership, and in the same work Jaures quotes Liebknecht to the same effect.

That is the position of the International Socialist movement. The vital point in Socialism is this: Whatever is used for exploitation must be collectively owned. A carpenter's kit of tools are means of production, but are not means by which men are exploited, and therefore may safely be left in private hands. The principle of Socialism is simply the collective ownership of those things which in private hands are means by which those private owners exploit the rest of the people and that is all we want to get hold of.

DEL. SPARGO (N. Y.): May I ask the Chairman of the Platform Committee a question, whether or not the committee contemplates that in the case of the holding of immense tracts of land not for exploitation, but for private pleasure parks, as in the Adirondack mountains, we should not socialize that land. There is land that is not used for exploitation, thousands of acres of the most beautiful country in the world, that is not used for exploitation, but kept away from the use of the people for the gratification of private luxury.

DEL. SIMONS (Ill.): I would say that the Committee is not so much concerned with the Utopian future as it is with the things that we are fighting for at the present moment. If those great tracts of land—personally I am in favor of taking them away—if those tracts of land stand in the way of the enjoyment of the workers of the country when they get control, they will take them,

and they will not ask what we said about it at this convention, either.

DEL. HOEHN (Mo.): There are two factions in this convention. One is for immediate demands and one is for revolutionary, scientific Socialism, the collective ownership of the means of production and nothing else. I favor the report of the committee.

Now, the comrades on the other side take the ground that this is not in line with International Socialism. I want to ask, do you realize that that position is a Utopian position, an anarchistic position, nothing else?

I want to say that it is a proper immediate demand to demand the nationalization of the railroads. It is a proper immediate demand to demand the municipalization of the street railroads. It is a proper immediate demand to demand a labor law for protection of men, women and children in factories.

Will you dare to get up here to oppose a law for the protection of men and women and little children in factories? If you do, you are certainly not in line with the International Socialist program.

I will tell what it means when you say that you want the collective ownership of the earth. You might just as well say that you are in favor of the collective ownership of the moon.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS (Ill.): This discussion does not belong here in connection with the matter now before the house, but it has been allowed to proceed. Year after year Socialist conventions suffer from this same disease, but each year, I am glad to say, it gets less virulent.

I admit that at one time I had a slight attack myself, but I am thankful to say I have recovered, and I hope I begin to realize and that others will begin to realize at last that we are a party engaged in a class struggle, and that that class struggle is not being fought tomorrow, nor in the cooperative commonwealth, but is being fought right here and now, month after month and year after year.

I believe that some of us have begun to realize that we are revolutionary party with our acts and not alone with our mouths. I believe that a few of us realize that we have passed from the Utopianism of Sir Thomas Moore and we have begun to do something more than paint pictures of the com-

ing Socialism, as Marx calls it, and have got down to the cold facts and are laying the foundation for the cooperative commonwealth here and now.

I want to tell you, whether you realize it or not, that you are with Babeuf, Cabet, Fourier and Bellamy and all the rest of them when you make your revolutionary Socialism rest upon a contest as to which one of you can paint the most radical, the most far-reaching, the most beautiful picture of what we will do some time in the future.

You are not helping class conscious scientific Socialism when you say that your Socialism consists in the declaration that we want all of the instruments of production and distribution. That does not constitute scientific revolutionary or class conscious Socialism; it constitutes Utopianism.

To be sure we all still hold to all that was good, all that was true, all that was best in the Utopian movement and we therefore hold before our eyes the time when we shall control and actively administer—not everything—I don't want collective ownership of tooth brushes—but all of those things that are used for exploitation, or that stand between us and the enjoyment of anything that we want.

The program of collective ownership is not for the purpose of making revolutionary phrases, but is for the purpose of stopping exploitation and stopping as much of it as we can now, and because of these facts, because I am a revolutionary Socialist and not a Utopian, because I am class conscious, believing in the class struggle here and now, I ask you to put aside this slight attack of measles so that the Socialist movement may go forward in the realization of the fact that we have got a fight now, a big fight, that exists all over this country and that it is big enough to keep us busy all this summer without worrying about the distant future.

DEL. HERMAN (Wash.): We revolutionary Socialists of the Pacific coast are also for immediate demands, but we are for immediate demands that will improve the conditions of the working class and not for immediate demands that will perpetuate the interests of the weaker portion of the capitalist class as against the stronger portion of the capitalist class.

We are not in favor of the nationalization of railroads or telegraphs. They have nationalized railroads in Russia, and nationalized telegraphs in Russia, but who is the government? The czar, and the feudal aristocracy, the rising capitalist class. Those railroads and telegraphs are run in the interests of the class who own the government.

We have government ownership of the postoffices in this country, and do you tell me, fellow wage-workers, that you have a voice in the administration of the postoffice? Why the men and women in the service of that institution are denied even the right to organize.

Yes, we are for immediate demands, but we are for demands that will not reduce the taxes of the controlling classes, or add to the taxes and expenses of the struggling workers; we are for immediate demands that will take away by the right of eminent domain, through the power of taxation, a portion of the wealth that the capitalist class has exploited from us, to use that as Comrade Fieldman suggested to provide employment for the victims of the capitalist class.

DEL. SIMONS: I just want to say inasmuch as this unemployed question is coming up again and again that the committee has a plank drafted on that subject and it will be here in a few minutes. Don't think that the committee overlooked that point.

DEL. KORNGOLD (Ill.): It would have been a good thing if some of the delegates who came to this convention had investigated matters before they talked about them. If the comrade who has spoken before me had investigated the government ownership of railroads he would have found that wherever government ownership of railroads has been applied it had benefited the working class. Over in Switzerland—the working people of Germany and of Switzerland, work ten hours a day where the American people, the working people on the railroads in America, could not get sixteen hours.

DEL. THOMPSON (Wis.): That is right.

DEL. KORNGOLD (Ill.): They worked eight hours in Germany under the government and they received higher wages than they received from the railroads in America despite the fact that the general wage scale is higher in

America. Do the comrades know this? We Socialists know that if you investigate the facts, you will find that government and municipal ownership practically under all circumstances lessen the burdens of the working class, and practically in every case lower the hours and raise the wages of labor.

Professor Parsons investigated some time ago municipal ownership in America, and he found that wages under municipal ownership were higher than wages under private ownership. He found that the hours of labor under municipal ownership, were 2½ hours less than under private ownership in the same line. You will find that in Switzerland and in practically every country in Europe, or for that matter on the globe, where the government is in the hands of the capitalist class, still the working people have been able to secure eight hours when we are not able to secure sixteen hours on privately owned railroads. While we Socialists want government ownership of railroads, we at the same time work for ownership of the government. These two things go together. We do not mean to leave the government in the hands of the capitalist class. But while we assimilate gradually these different means of production and distribution we, at the same time, gradually assimilate the government itself.

DEL. WILLIAMS (Minn.): I have never in my life been accused of being an opportunist. In fact, in many sections of the country where I have been because of the position I had taken I have been called an impossibilist. That is not true, however. I believe in immediate demands. I believe that there is a certain line at which we must draw the mark, and over which we must not step in our immediate demands for the benefit of the middle class. I believe in a program of immediate demands. I believe in the ultimate assimilation of all the means of production and distribution, all the land and machinery as an ultimate end. But I believe that for an immediate program, in order as the platform states to strengthen the power of the working class in its fight for this ultimate aim, we need these immediate planks. I believe, as the Comrade from Washington stated, that the Socialist party ought to advocate these immediate planks that will strengthen the work-

ing class and not the middle class, and when I raise my voice in defense of immediate demands, I want it clearly understood that it is the immediate demands which will be put into operation if the Socialists get control of Congress in the United States, that it is an injunction to our representatives in any legislative body that we want immediate government ownership of railroads, of telegraphs, of telephones, and other public affairs of that kind by the various governmental bodies, or administrative bodies, for the purpose of improving the condition of the wage-earners engaged in those industries.

There is a little step to be taken before we realize our ultimate aim. There will be several years required for the transition period, and during that period there are different conflicting interests between the small capitalist element and the large capitalist element, between the higher power and the lower power in the capitalist class, and during the time when the small capitalists are trying to get relief from the burden of taxation and other things they will advocate the government ownership of railroads and other things in order to release them from those burdens. The Socialist party will aid them in getting the government ownership, but always with this purpose in view of shortening the hours and taking advantage of that assistance which in some cases we may get from the smaller capitalist to bring about the final extinction of all capitalism.

A DELEGATE: I never saw a Socialist convention in such a muddle. I want to be protected from an opportunist's platform on one side and an impossibilist's platform on the other. What is the situation here? The platform says we only want the land that is used for exploitation. Leaving out of consideration the millions of acres of land that are held out of cultivation, or out of use for many purposes—

DEL. VANDER PORTEN (N. Y.): That is exploitation.

THE DELEGATE: The impossibilists want ownership of all the means of production and distribution, which would mean the whole of my yard, if I raised some potatoes. They are both confused, and it is due, in my opinion, to the manner in which our platform is drawn. I stand for immediate demands,

but I don't stand for immediate demands, unless the platform first tells us that what we want is a government by the working class, and it does not do that. When I see a plank in the platform that tells the American working people that the Socialists stand for government by the working people, the working class, a working class dictator, then I am in favor of immediate demands, but not before. One of the speakers, Comrade Simons, talked about Utopianism. Is it Utopianism to talk about an industrial state? Does the Platform Committee stand for a political state? Under Socialism what will we stand for, a political representative state, or an industrial state? You have the political state, the present police state, of shipping and of all that goes with it. If Comrade Simons understands Socialism, and I believe he does, then he knows that the Socialist movement has for its aim to do away with the political state and substitute the industrial state. I maintain that the platform does not point that out. The platform is Utopian in its preamble. I maintain the purpose of the Socialist movement is to get control of the Government and establish a dictatorship of the working class, under which ownership of the means of production and distribution may be brought about.

DEL. WANHOPE (N. Y.): I wish to take a few moments of your time regarding this question of the nationalization of railroads, telephones and telegraphs, contained in the first clause under discussion. The delegate from Illinois tells us that where there is national ownership of public utilities it has benefitted the working class. I am not going to deny that. From my reading, I am inclined to believe that there is a great measure of truth in it, but I want to say right here that there is nothing absolutely necessary in the fact that national ownership of railroads, railroads under government ownership, benefits the working class. It generally does, however, but the reason I stand for it, is this, and this is a point that I think has been forgotten by all the speakers here. Today, we are seeing encroachments after encroachments on the regime of private property in the means of life, and every time a utility is taken over and made public by nationalization, even with a capitalist gov-

ernment in control, so much does it limit the area of private ownership in the means of production and distribution.

President Roosevelt is a good deal wiser than some of the delegates here, because when he sees these encroachments upon private ownership and calls them the greatest national disaster that can take place, he does that because he knows that when one encroachment is made upon the arena of private property, it means opening the door to all others, and so far as this is advocated by the middle class, it is merely part and parcel of the same process of preparing society for collective ownership, which the great trusts and the big capitalists are doing in preparing society for this coming change. Let me say that if you understand the Socialist philosophy thoroughly, you are not confused in argument by the fact that certain classes in society are trying to save themselves by simulating something that you want to do. Every one of you knows that the middle class is dying. Your philosophy shows you that it is doomed. It is between the upper and the nether millstone, and must disappear. But you are afraid that this petty bourgeois element in its desperate effort to save itself by nationalizing utilities is thereby going to save itself. They cannot do it. They are playing into your hands, because you understand the philosophy of the situation, and they do not. It took me a long time to see some of these things. If you understood that no matter what they do, or what they don't do, they cannot stop this irresistible drift toward Socialism, it will greatly simplify this whole matter. I care little for government ownership in itself. You can't go to Russia and tell me the people are better off there, but I see this movement as part of this irresistible process, and the capitalists themselves are digging their own graves, and when you see a little bourgeois shouting for government ownership of gas, or telephones, or telegraph, you simply see him digging shovelfull after shovelfull out of the hole in which we will later bury the whole capitalist system. His efforts are exactly the same as the efforts of the trade unions trying to reach the question of the monopoly of labor by increasing his wages. He cannot do it. If a little business man does get his margin over taxes increased, it means

simply that the great trust is going to take that margin from him a little later on and his last state will be worse than his first. I ask you to consider today that every factor working in society is not working against you. Some of them are working in your direction, and it is your duty as a Socialist to co-operate with them. We are not going to get Socialism at once. There are a great many things that we are going to stand for that are of no immediate benefit to the working class, but they are part of the road that we have to travel. You may say that we see the cooperative commonwealth in the future, but it lies away ahead. We are not to reach it in one bound. We do not know all the roads, the mountains, the valleys, the swamps and the pitfalls that lie between us and that co-operative commonwealth, but we do know that every force and tendency in society is working in the direction of that co-operative commonwealth.

DEL. HAZLETT (Mont.): I would like to add the voice of Montana for a constructive theory of Socialism. As was said by one of the grandest woman workers for International Socialism—she said that those who defended the ideas such as we have heard here in the name of revolutionary, scientific Socialism, that the persons who advocated them were either very young, or very ignorant. So it is, my friends, when we talk of the new order of society into which we hope to come, we talk about revolution without ever attempting to do anything to revolutionize the present system. How in the name of common sense can we change our condition without working upon some plan by which we can formulate that change? I remember one time hearing the president of my university, David Starr Jordan, say that we had reached the time when mankind consciously affects the evolutionary process. Whatever that change may be into which we go, we ourselves have got to chisel out with the power of the human intellect which we have developed. We have got to formulate the change that is to come. I would not undertake to say whether we could all at once take over all the land or whether the little farmer should have his little farm, but I want to say that in Montana where the state already owns large areas of coal fields, that there is

an immediate proposition that the Socialists of Montana have got to work upon. So wherever we reach points upon which we, as representatives of the working class, can work, that is the thing that we should work upon, the thing next to us in the interest of the working class, anything that will strengthen the hands of the working class, anything that will help them to move forward and make progress against capitalism, and it is in our own dooryard where we must fight him today. I question very much if upon a large comprehensive basis it is not going to be easier for us to expropriate the bondholders than it is the private capitalists. The private capitalists can give some sort of reason for its existence upon the ground of being a promoter, or of superintendency or something of that sort, but the bond holder can give no reason, no real reason, to society why he should draw his income from them; and so it is, my friends, speaking for Montana and for what we have in a very small way entered upon—we have been striving for a constructive plan of work, something that everyone can see is a benefit to the working class, and that is one reason why I think that this party should formulate demands in the interest of organized labor, as they go into this campaign confronting and fighting the capitalist government with its courts, that we should make this a battle cry, a battle program around which we could rally. I also thank Comrade Fieldman of New York, who spoke here with reference to the unemployed, for the two points which he brought forward where the Socialist party has shown its intelligence, the matter of unemployed and the rent strikes in New York City. We stand for a constructive platform, at least the Montana delegation does, and I hope this convention of American Socialists will take their stand with the International Socialists of the world for common sense and reason against hot air and ignorance.

A DELEGATE: I move the previous question.

SEVERAL DELEGATES: Second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: The previous question has been called for. Those in favor of that motion will say aye. Those opposed, no. The ayes have it.

DEL. FURMAN: My motion was

moved and seconded before any other motion that the words "all the land" be inserted in the first plank of the platform and there has been only one or two of the comrades who have spoken to the point. I take the position with the soapboxers on the corner—perhaps my experience has been about the same as the rest of you—about three times out of four there will be a single taxer come to the meeting and you have got to answer him, and if you don't have an express explicit statement in your platform, you will have to take up a large portion of your time talking in language which the average fellow coming along the street will not understand, trying to make your position plain to that individual, because you have not worded your platform properly, making him understand and all others understand what you are driving at. The plank as it stands with the exception of that one omission is all right. Do you want a platform plank there that you can put intelligently to the ordinary working man who comes to the street corner and make him understand? If you want that, then you must necessarily have the public ownership of land there. That does not say that somebody is going to have the privilege of using my tooth brush or my trousers. Neither does it say that every individual who occupies land and uses it as he has to do in the house in which he lives cannot occupy that land and that house. But it does put the thing plainly to the people who are not all educated up in the terminology which you use and which I use in the Socialist propaganda. I want it so plain that the wayfarer, though a fool, can understand it and read it while he runs. I want that in there and I have been instructed from New York in a general way to have that plank voted for, and I want it at the head of the platform because I consider it the most important plank in the platform, and it should be worded so plainly that the men who go out to explain Socialism can make the wayfarer understand what they are driving at. As land is one of the necessary essentials in the means of production, it should be in the platform. You should have it in such words that no one will have to go around and ask somebody else what it means. It does not mean that we shall take away the farmer's little piece of land which

he is working on; it doesn't mean anything of that kind, but if you don't put that in there it gives every Tom, Dick and Harry who knows anything about the theories of Henry George an opportunity to make trouble for your speakers, to upset everything you say and finally you have got to come down to the proposition that land is just as necessary as tools.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have before you the proposition of the committee, proposed to be amended by inserting the words "all the land" and second the substitution of "collective" in place of "national," where it pertains to the industries, and third you have the main question. Now, they are so bound up together that it is impossible to make a division and get a clear understanding of the whole. I shall rule that on each there shall be two for and two against the proposition and I must hear from the speaker which side he or she speaks for, and whether it is the main question, the first or second amendment.

DEL. CANNON (Ari.): I want to point out to Comrade Clark of Texas, that when I called this matter to the attention of the convention last evening and asked Comrade Simons what was the meaning of the word "exploitation" Comrade Simons did not answer my question. Comrade Work came to his rescue and I was hammered down.

I contend that the public ownership of all machinery and land is one of the things for which the Socialist party is working. If some of the comrades get up and tell us in Germany they are not working for that I move that we inform the German comrades that they are behind the times. The idea of not including the land is nothing more nor less than political expediency. I am going to refer to a farmer state, and if newspaper reports are true it is the most prosperous farmer state in the union, and that is Oklahoma. Discussing this proposition with the delegates from Oklahoma I learned that eighty-nine per cent of the farms in that state are mortgaged. You come along with revolutionary Socialism. Now are you going to keep those farmers under that mortgage? Hearst or Billy Bryan would be ashamed to go out and offer those farmers such a proposition as that. They tell us that we must relieve the laboring class of private ownership, but for political expediency we must not relieve

the farmer of private ownership. I want to relieve the farmer. In Arizona we have more locals among the farmers than we have in the industrial centers, and we don't preach graduated income tax or government ownership of railroads. We teach straight Socialism and the farmers are just anxious to get rid of their farms. The same condition exists in New Mexico and I am informed that in Texas the farmers are intensely anxious to get rid of the farms.

It was decided to have only four speeches after the ordering of the previous question, instead of four speeches on each question and a closing speech by the chairman of the committee.

DEL. COLE (Cal.): I speak against this first clause in the report of the committee, and I urge all constructive brainy and thoughtful people to listen to this argument.

Comrades, there is nothing I desire more than a constructive platform, and the basis of that constructive platform must be greater power in the hands of the people. This clause is for national ownership of railroads, etc., etc., and the further you take it the worse you make it, and for this reason. You and I all know that our authorities today represent only the capitalist class, and every atom of public property you put into their hands to handle the worse you make it for the people. The first thing you want is greater democracy, the initiative and referendum, the imperative mandate, and in a practical form, and those should come first before we have any public ownership more than we have now.

Seven men control all the railroads west of the Mississippi from Canada to Mexico. Now then, you want public ownership of those railroads. Why? Because one set of capitalists want to down another set of capitalists. That is why you want national ownership of railroads. Suppose you get it. You will have them and these people will put the capital released from the railroads into other industries. We Socialists don't mean it that way. Don't you know—you do know—you do know that the Democratic party and that the Hearst party will make the same pledge in their platforms. Don't you know—you do know that we won't get any votes for our ticket by that sort of thing. The people who want that sort of thing will say there will be more votes for the Democratic party and so we will vote

for them. But it is not a question of what we want to get. I want to say that there is a very serious danger before the American people, more so than ever before. We have organized our industries to a greater extent, we have larger capitalist and trust control than any other people on the face of the earth and the greatest danger we have to face is the further organization of industry, the further organization of capital before we have the power in our hands to control it. Comrades, you have read that work by Jack London which paints the centralized organization of capital, the growth of this enormous power in their hands. When we have the initiative, the referendum and the imperative mandate, then we can control the situation. We should make that our immediate demand. That should come first and then the Socialists and the working classes will be in such a shape that we can control legislation and safely take hold of these great utilities and run them ourselves.

DEL. WORK (Iowa): I speak in favor of the committee's report and against the amendment inserting the word "land." I am in favor of the amendment substituting the word "collective" for "national." There is one point that I want to make and that is that the committee to which the platform is to be referred as to style and so forth should put in the word "social" after the word "other" and make it read "every other social means of transportation and communication," because I think we are all agreed that we don't want the public or collective ownership of buggies, bicycles, and so forth, with which people transport themselves.

Like Comrade Furman, I have had a little experience in speaking on the subject of Socialism, not only on the streets of Chicago, New York City, and on Boston Common, but also in the villages and hamlets in the East and in the Middle West and in some portions of the far West, and I know the greatest objection which the Socialist agitator has to go up against in those places and which the local comrades of the Socialist party have to go up against in those places is the fact that the farmers think that we want to deprive them of their

little farms, which they are using on their own account. I don't want a paragraph, or a word, inserted in this platform which will uphold the idea that we are going to expropriate the little farmer, because the little farmer is not an exploiter. We have stated in the body of this platform which we adopted yesterday that the small farmer is exploited, not in the same manner, but none the less effectively, as the wage worker. We have already adopted that proposition, and therefore we have taken the stand that the small farmer is not an exploiter. If he is not an exploiter and is not using the land for exploitation, why should that land be publicly owned? We do not need to make it publicly owned for the purpose of carrying out our object. If we declare for the collective ownership of that land, then we bar all of that great section of the working class out of the Socialist movement, because they will not stand for it. The farming industry has taken an altogether different course of development from the other industries. It has been demonstrated by actual experience that the great farm cannot compete with the small farm, and therefore the collective farm is not scientific or economic. Cries of "no, no," and "I don't believe it."

DEL. WORK: Furthermore, the fact that the farmers do operate their farms privately, that material fact, the material surroundings of the farmers, have their necessary psychological effect upon them and cause them to be opposed to the collective ownership of farm land, even if it were economic. The farmers are a portion of the working class, and we want the whole working class in the Socialist movement. We should not make a declaration in our platform which will bar out any section of the working class, but should try to attract the whole working class to our movement. The farmers of the United States can be attracted to the Socialist movement if we will simply use a little common sense in order to state our position clearly so that they will not misunderstand it and will not think that we intend to take away their little farms.

Adjourned until 2 P. M.

AFTERNOON SESSION

The convention was called to order at 2 P. M.

COMMUNICATIONS.

ASST. SEC. STRICKLAND: We have lots of greetings. We have only telegrams before us now; and comrades, some of these telegrams are very important.

Here is one from the Young People's Socialist League, Chicago:

"Grand success to the Socialist convention. Three cheers for International Socialism."

One from Urbana, Ohio:

"Be courageous. The eyes of the world are upon you, Socialists. Fraternally,

"F. Brown, Prest."

"The Scandinavian Socialists send through their weekly newspaper greetings, hale and hearty. Your achievement will be our inspiration.

"G.A.A. P.A.A."

"Girard, Kansas, May 15, 1908.

"Ben Hanford, Care Socialist Convention, Brand's Hall, Chicago.

"Heartly congratulations and hand-clasp across the spaces. The posts of honor assigned us are posts of honor only because they are posts of duty and responsibility. You will vindicate brilliantly the wisdom of the convention and I hope at least to keep it from reproach. Greetings to the greatest convention ever assembled in the United States. Cheers for the revolution.

"Eugene V. Debs."

"Girard, Kansas, May 15, 1908.

"Frederic Heath, Secretary Socialist Convention, Brand's Hall, Chicago.

"Nothing would give me greater joy than to appear before the convention and make in person my acknowledgement to the delegates, but an extraordinary situation makes it next to impossible for me to leave here at this moment, and I am reluctantly compelled to beg for the first and only time the convention's indulgence until I can report for duty, which I shall do without a moment of unnecessary delay. We have all caught

the inspiration of the unexampled work you have done this week. It will make a shining place in American history.

"Eugene V. Debs."

"Girard, Kansas, May 15, 1908.

"Frederic Heath, Secretary Socialist Party Convention:

"My dear comrades:—Deeply touched by the incomparable honor you have for the third time conferred upon me, I accept the nomination for the presidency, returning to each of you, to the convention as a whole, and to the party at large, my sincere thanks. The hearty unanimity with which the nomination is made and the magnificent spirit in which it is tendered fill me and thrill me with inexpressible emotion and arouse within me all the latent energy and enthusiasm to serve the Socialist party and the great cause it represents, with all the mental, moral and physical strength of my being.

"Personally, I had earnestly hoped the convention would choose otherwise, but as individual desire is subordinate to the party will, I can only wish myself greater strength and fitness to bear the revolutionary banner of the working class you have placed in my hands.

"Permit me to congratulate you upon the nomination of Comrade Hanford, and to express my personal gratification in having a comrade so loyal to share in upholding the proletarian standard. At a later day I shall make formal answer to your notification.

"This year the command to advance must be issued to all the hosts of socialist emancipation. The working class of the United States must be aroused this year and made to feel the quickening pulse, the throbbing hope, and the stern resolve of the social revolution. The greatest opportunity in the history of the socialist movement spreads out before us like a field of glory.

"The principles of the Socialist party are resplendent with the truths which crown them. Its very name is prophetic and its spirit is literal fulfillment in this auspicious hour supreme with opportunity. Duty to the cause transcends all else, and touching elbows, and hearts keeping time to the quicksteps of the

revolution, we march beneath the banner (no compromise) to certain victory.

"My soul love and greeting to you all my comrades. My heart is full and overflowing. With every drop of my blood and every fibre of my being I render obedience to your command, and offer myself, body and soul, to the Socialist party, the working class and the revolution. Eugene V. Debs."

DEL. FARRELL (Ohio): I rise to call for three rousing cheers for Comrade Debs. (Cheers.)

FINAL REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS.

THE CHAIRMAN: On behalf of the Committee on Resolutions I ask the indulgence of the convention that they may present their final report, and if there are no objections we will take this matter up now. There are only one or two resolutions, and then their work will be done.

DEL. SPARGO: The Resolutions Committee desires naturally to be relieved of its responsibilities. We have two matters only, which we believe the convention can act upon in a minute or two, and then we will ask for our discharge, and that will prevent the possibility of a waste of time occurring through our having to report from time to time. I will read the resolutions:

PROPAGANDA AMONG SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.

First: Those of you who have the report of the last national convention before you will find on page 277 a resolution relating to the advisability of conducting Socialist propaganda among the privates in the army and navy and state militia. The Resolutions Committee at the convention four years ago reported adversely and was sustained by the convention by an overwhelming vote. The matter has been raised again, and your Resolutions Committee, realizing that it is impossible for us to do anything in the matter here, desires to offer this resolution:

"The convention recommends that the National Executive Committee consider the question of instituting a special propaganda among the privates of the army and navy and the state militia."

Comrade Chairman, I move the adoption of this resolution, referring the

matter to the National Executive Committee. (Seconded.) Carried.

APPRECIATION OF ARRANGEMENTS AND SERVICES.

DEL. SPARGO: Second. This is a resolution which surely we can be unanimous upon, as it is nothing more than the ordinary courtesies of a body of this character.

"The convention hereby desires to place upon the record its appreciation of the arrangements for the convention made by the local comrades. To their efforts much of the success of the convention is due.

"Thanks are also tendered to the secretaries of the convention for their arduous and valuable services."

Comrade Chairman, I move the adoption of that resolution.

Seconded and carried. Committee discharged.

FINAL REPORT OF FARMERS' COMMITTEE.

DEL. THOMPSON (Wis.), chairman of the Farmers' Committee, presented the following report:

I would like to say, first, that we have here a majority report, and that one member of the committee will present a minority report, so that you will have both aspects of this subject before you. This is the resolution which we recommend:

"Resolved, by the Socialist Party that the general program of Socialism will in itself, aside from any specific reference to agriculture, bring a very great measure of relief to the agricultural working classes.

"The socialization of industry, carrying with it as it will a vast improvement in the condition of the wage working class, raising their standard of living and thereby increasing their power, will render more stable the market for farm products.

"The collective ownership of the railroads and the great industrial monopolies, by destroying their power of oppressing the wage earning class, will at the same time destroy the power of the capitalist to exploit the farming class, thus securing to them immediate relief and advantage.

"With reference to the specific application of Socialism to agriculture, the first steps in the program of Socialism

should be taken against the great industries which are ripe for collectivism and already form a virtual monopoly. The farm machinery trust, the beet sugar trust, the oil trust, the land monopoly, and any other private monopolies that may arise within the agricultural sphere will be socialized among the first.

"And as for the ownership of the land by the small farmers, it is not essential to the Socialist program that any farmer shall be dispossessed of the land which he himself occupies and tills."

DEL. THOMPSON: On behalf of the committee I move the adoption of this resolution.

THE CHAIRMAN: The minority will please present its report.

DEL. BARZEE (Ore.): Comrades, you have got me in a very precarious position. I am more used to running round with the cows and the horses than to facing such a sea of faces as I see before me.

I was appointed upon this committee and I took my place with them, and when I present my report you will not find it so very different from the one they have. I want to tell you my reasons for bringing in a minority report.

We were called to convene immediately, which we did, in a back room here, or behind the curtain, and some instructions came to us very forcibly what we should do. We appointed a meeting and we convened at the next point for further consideration of the question. We agreed then, during that meeting, that it was not probable that we could agree, and that we would disagree upon a certain particular point which I will mention later. There was another meeting called peremptorily, I believe, behind the curtain again, which I attended. We were very near an agreement on this proposition, when we were again informed by one of the members of the committee that it was presumptuous for us to try to agree, and I was started off down the road. I was told that there was no compromise on that point, and I left the committee to draft my report. After that meeting I was notified to participate in another one. Expecting the same thing, and not being able to compete with Chicago—I have always heard it was the windy city—I did not go. That committee could outwind me all right.

So if my report differs but little from

theirs, you will understand why I bring in a minority report.

I hereby submit the following minority report and beg your consideration of the same.

"We recognize the class struggle and the necessity for united action among the world's workers of every vocation as against the capitalists class exploitation.

"The Socialist party stands for construction and not destruction, for adhesion and not destruction, for adherence pledges to the small farmer protection through the socialization of the national industries, in the production for use and not for profit.

"We therefore recommend that the farmer study the economies of the co-operative social system as against the individual competitive system, and ally his political power in the struggle for existence with the party of his class. But, we insist that any attempt to pledge to the farmer anything but a complete socialization of the industries of the nation to be unsocialistic."

DEL. CLARK (Texas): I move the adoption of the minority report.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have before you, comrades, the reports of the majority and the minority. The action occurs upon the acceptance of the minority report. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. SLAYTON (Pa.): Mr. Chairman and comrades: There is a great deal of room for discussion, I realize, between those who believe that nothing should be done to prevent an individual following the line that his own mind would indicate, that nothing should be done by the collectivity to prevent an individual using certain forms of production, if he can do it himself. Under the machine philosophy, if it may be so dignified, I might use an acre or ten acres or twenty acres of land, or run a little mill or shop or mine myself, if I don't exploit somebody else. There seems to be a great deal of room for argument between those who adopt that line of argument and those who say that even if it is shown that I am occupying a piece of land or a mill or a little shop, like the old shoemaker's shop, if you please, and not exploiting anybody else, it should not be done, because I would not be working for the good of the whole. Some say that that would be a destruction of individuality. If

that be true, then the capitalists are right when they speak of individual initiative and the right of the individual to do what he pleases.

Let us grant for the sake of argument that if I own five, ten or twenty acres of land, and make up my mind that I can stand to work twenty-four hours a day and raise a certain amount of crop and do it myself, I ought to be allowed to do it, because I was exploiting nobody else. Let us agree, for the sake of argument that I should have the right to do this; but would it not be more wise to do these things in general society? You would discourage me from so doing, even if you didn't want to prevent me in any way. It would be reasonable to use the tools and machinery that have been supplied and by their use save so much human energy. It is not common sense, to say nothing of good economy, to hold that collective society should do everything and ought to discourage any individual from wasting his energies.

I am reminded of an answer I made to a man some years ago, on the spur of the moment, to a question that is pertinent right now, and I am going to submit it to you and ask you to consider it. He wanted me to help elect him to congress, and said that he believed in government ownership of railroads, and expected me to fall right in line.

I said, "Why, we have it now." He said, "How do you mean?" I said, "Don't the railroad companies own the government and own the railroads, too? You have got government ownership now."

Then he said he believed in the municipal ownership of waterworks and electric light plants. He happened to be president of an independent oil refining company, and I asked him about oil wells and oil refining machinery, whether he believed in government ownership of those. He immediately went up in the air, and when he came down again I said I was willing to dispossess the railroad companies when he was willing to be dispossessed of his oil wells. Then he said, "Where will you draw the line between social ownership and government ownership—between what the individual might use as his private property and what society should control and use?"—and I said "At the yard gate." I didn't mean by that that we were to fence off that little piece of land in the

sense that "possession" means now, but when you are collectively using and collectively managing those things that you have collectively made—I don't care on how small a scale it may be—because you ought to enlarge the scale on account of economy; when you have done that you have stopped the possibility of traffic and of profit and removed the effects that grow out of that kind of thing. So you draw the line at the imaginary line of the fence.

DEL. CAREY (Mass.): I have only a word to say upon the matter and I say it because, as a member of the Platform Committee, my position might be understood. I think, first, that we ought to confine ourselves to the question under discussion. We need light upon the relation of the Socialist movement towards the farmer and upon the question of land and land ownership.

I believe that I can make my position clear, and it is this: I recognize the fact that today, under capitalism, land is the property of the nation, and by the national laws the management or ownership is regulated. Today the nation permits individuals to hold titles to land, subject to conditions. One condition, for instance, is that they must pay taxes on that land. If they fail to pay taxes, the nation takes it away from them and sells it to the next highest bidder.

The theory of national ownership of land is already affirmed by the present government. Now, then, what is the change that I wish should be made? If it is not specifically stated in the platform, it should be made clear.

I understand the platform committee, and I mention it in relation to the proposition submitted by the Committee on Farmers, while recognizing the fact that the nation theoretically today is the owner of the land, and since the form of the industrial development in the agricultural districts is not such as to make the operation of all agricultural industry collective as yet, that while affirming the national ownership of land, permission is given to individuals to use that land on the basis of occupancy and use, but not to be used for exploitation.

Now, I do not know whether that is clear. Let me repeat it and conclude. Today, under capitalism, the ownership of land is vested in the nation. We cannot affirm it more clearly than it is already affirmed by the present government. I deny the present manner by

which the government allots the land to individuals through titles.

I say that the right position is that the ownership should be vested in the people collectively, the nation; second, the right to land should be determined by occupancy and use, and that that use should not carry with it the power of exploitation. This I understand to be the position of the Committee on Platform. If it is not, I as a member of the committee, disagree with it. I do not believe that the resolution brought in by the majority of the Farmers' Committee expresses clearly that position, and hence I am opposed to it.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT (Wash.): If we are anything we are Socialists, and if we are Socialists we believe that ultimately this capitalist system will develop to a point whereby all means of production and distribution will be so centralized and so developed and so trustified that the Socialists will have very little trouble in managing them after they get them. Now, if the farmer, if the man who wishes land to use for himself, has a right to the use of that land, then it is also logical to suppose that I personally can at any time buy myself any machine of production any place in the world and use that machine of production for myself, manufacture the goods I wish to manufacture for myself, sell them myself, and get what I can get for them and keep that for myself. It is ridiculous. It is reactionary. There is not a man on this floor who will assume that industry, aside from the land question, will not develop and is not developing, is not trustifying.

No man will disagree with that, and if that is a fact, is it not also a fact that farms are being owned more and more by corporations, that bonanza farming is becoming more and more a reality?

I make this point, that all industry is tending to trustification. We can all agree to that. I make the point also that farms are being trustified. I make the point, and I reiterate what another comrade has said before, in speaking for Oklahoma, that 87 per cent of the farmers in Oklahoma are at present working their farms either under a mortgage or by renting them. If that is true, that condition will not last very long.

DEL. PAYNE (Texas): If the Socialist movement stands for anything it

stands for the working class, the proletariat. The condition of the farmer today is exactly the same as that of the wage worker. The farmer may own his little piece of land and raise his products, but he does not finish production. Production is not finished until the product passes through all the different phases and is delivered at the door of the consumer.

The same things that stand between the wage earner and the finished product stand between the farmer and the finished product. The same things that stand between the wage earner and economic independence stand between the farmer and economic independence.

Take the farmers today; most of them are propertyless, most of them are landless. They, as well as the wage earner, want the social ownership of all the machinery of production. The farmer is exploited because all along the line from the farmer to the finished product stand the capitalists who have trustified these industries. They stand there, and when they pull the string the farmer out there dances to their tune, and he is just as dependent as the wage earner.

We stand for the collective ownership of capital, that which is used in wealth production, and I want to know if this convention of this movement which we call the great revolutionary movement is going to go down in history as catering to a small middle class of land owners, or are you going to stand for the great proletarian farming class? I would just as soon belong to the Hearst element, or the Roosevelt Reform element, or the Bryan element, and stand on their platform, as to stand on the one that has been offered here today.

As I understand it, under Socialism there will be no wage earners. As long as you have wages it means that the worker is exploited. Wages means that there is a surplus value that is paid in profits to somebody. As I understand it, we don't stand for any sort of wages whatever. We stand for the emancipation of the working class, and in doing that we must stand for the collective ownership, not only of the means of wealth production and distribution, but also of the land.

In this great struggle do not forget the proletarian class. In the year 1900 only one per cent of the great working class owned their own homes. When I

hear them talk about Socialism taking away their homes I say it will not take them away from very many, because there are not many that have any. But Socialism would take the land away from nobody. But, as my friend over there has told you, the ownership of the land is already vested in the state. Socialism would simply take it and make it a different form, make it collective ownership.

DEL. O'HARE (Okla.): I do not want to take up my entire five minutes, but I do want to say that I agree with Comrade Carey that by the theory of government today—and there are twenty lawyers on the floor of this convention who are class-conscious Socialists who will undoubtedly confirm this statement—the state, the sovereignty, has never relinquished its ownership of the land.

I agree with our brilliant and magnetic comrade from Texas who has just spoken, that the common people haven't got the land. I submit that the comrades who have spoken have all spoken to the same point, that we should declare to the farmers that we propose that the farmer whose present means of life is his interest in a certain tract of land will not be dumped out in the cold, like an Indian Territory renter when he cannot pay his rent.

I live in a state where one-ninth of the land is owned absolutely and the title vests in the state of Oklahoma. And if you will get into a buggy with me and drive out into the country, you need pass only one school section to be able to identify every other school section in the state; for no farmer ever turns an extra spadeful of dirt on that rented land, rented from the state of Oklahoma, that he don't have to turn. And you will find among the revolutionary, class-conscious Socialists out there that every one is fighting tooth and nail to get forty acres of land in fee. Now, Socialism proposes that until farming becomes co-operative, and so long as it is done on the present basis, that the man who is doing a piece of work shall have a place to put his feet while he is working. And I would like to have this Farmers' Committee agree to put in form this resolution that we of Oklahoma and we of Washington can all agree to, for we all want the same thing, that no man shall represent or no man understand that Socialism pro-

poses to rob him of what he now considers the essential of his life, a place to be employed.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): Now let us talk a little common sense. I will be brief, because I am not an orator nor a perorator, as I would be told by our proletarian comrades from the state where they know it all. Do you want to learn anything about municipal ownership? Ask Wisconsin. Do you want information about the farmer question? Wisconsin knows all about it. And all because they have got a few aldermen elected and some men doing legislative work.

DEL. THOMPSON: I object to the personalities.

DEL. SLOBODIN: I say simply that they are people who know it all, and I do not. But I do remember that four years ago some comrades from Wisconsin told us that they wanted a municipal program. They said, "How can we go to work in our municipalities and our legislatures unless we have a municipal program. We must have a municipal program." Somehow or other this question was submitted to the committee. I was doubtful at that time whether we needed a municipal program, but I concluded they were right. When I came here this time I expected, of course, to find them in the same frame of mind, but I find that the Wisconsin delegation say they don't want a municipal program. If they ask for an immigration resolution or a farmers' program, I will ask them to postpone consideration of the question for four years and refer it to a committee, and perhaps by that time they will have again reconsidered and they will say they don't want any farmers' program. If there is any farmer question in the state or any municipal question in the state, they can adopt any farmers' program to meet the situation.

Now, Comrade Thompson, for the majority of this committee comes before you with a certain first step towards a program, I would call it. They say they want certain things because that means "the raising of the standard of living of the wage-working class, which will inure to the benefit of the farming class." Now, if that is what Socialism means, I haven't studied Socialism. Then I must go to Wisconsin. I must forget all that I knew about Socialism and must learn it all anew. They say that the first step

towards Socialism, or words to that effect, is the socialization of the great industries, and then they tell us that the first step towards Socialism is to get rid of the landlord.

I favor the minority resolution with this exception: There is a phrase there which states that the farmer should join the party that stands for his class, or words to that effect. I move an amendment, or a substitute, to strike out the words "of his class" and substitute the words "of the working class," and then I will be satisfied to accept the minority report. (Seconded.)

This amendment was accepted by Delegate Barzee.

DEL. KNOPFNAGEL (Ill.): Once upon a time I was an impossibilist. I came over to this country with ideas that a farmer cannot be made to understand what Socialism means and what Socialism stands for. I have preached these ideas everywhere until some three or four years ago, when the state organizer of the state of Michigan first invited me to make a tour there. He sent me out among the farmers, much to my dissatisfaction.

When I came to the first farmer meeting I prepared myself, had all the fire ready, and began to talk as fiery as I could; but I found out that I didn't talk fiery enough for the farmers. I found out that the farmers were more revolutionary than I was, and I considered myself more revolutionary than the American working class was. Then I came to the conclusion that if the Socialist party wants to have the farmers with them, whether the farmer has land or has no land, there is no need of fearing to go before them with a strict revolutionary Socialist platform. You can go to him and explain to him the Socialist principles. Show him the relations between him as a farmer and the city working class. Show him his dependence and the dependence of the working class upon the same common enemy, and he grasps it and he understands it, and you don't need to go to him with Utopias to be realized in the future.

Tell him in plain language that the Socialist party stands for the common ownership, not only of machinery, etc., but also of the land, and he is only too glad to give that ownership of land into the hands of the people, instead of having it under the mort-

gages of the capitalist class. Don't fear, comrades, to adopt the minority report as amended by Comrade Slobodin.

DEL. BERGER: There is no intention and no inclination on the part of the platform committee to deny that we stand for the common ownership of the land. I fully agree with Comrade Carey on this point. It is simply a question of how he expresses it. But there can be no doubt that evolution was different in the agricultural field, that centralization in land has not taken the same form as it did in industry.

In other words, the prediction of the Marxians that we would some day have centralized the small farms into big farms of one hundred thousand or a million acres has not come true.

We do not know what the future of agriculture is going to be. We do not know whether in the future agriculture will be conducted on a very large scale or whether the future of agriculture will be the intensive farming of very small tracts.

There is a great deal to be said on both sides. Just now it looks, with the inventions that are being made in the line of agricultural chemistry and in the use of electricity, that the future of agriculture will be intensive farming, and that some day three or four acres will be sufficient to supply a family with all its needs.

However, we are not going to make a platform or program for unborn generations. We are dealing with the problem as it is now. And the truth of the matter is that centralization has not taken place in agriculture, as it has in the field of industry.

Besides there is another phase of the question to be considered.

The process of manufacturing has been changed entirely by the inventions which took place in shop and factory. It has not only separated the producer from the product; it has not only separated the man who uses the instruments from ownership of these instruments, but it has also changed the entire process.

That is not the case in farming. There the introduction of the machine has not changed the entire process of agriculture. And it has not separated the owner of the farm from the farm. If you will look at the census, you will find the average size of farms in America was about 139 acres in 1880, then

it went down to 134 in 1890, and then it went up again to 138 acres in 1900. The average size of the farms has practically remained stationary during the last thirty years. It is true that there are more tenant farmers now than we ever had before, but that is due to the fact, that down South after the slave barons had been defeated, they divided up their big plantations and rented many small parcels to the negroes. That has changed the general average somewhat; that is, there are more tenant farmers.

There is also the fact to be considered, that one can still get land in western states, for instance Wisconsin, at \$5 an acre, but, of course, it is wild land. You can get better land out west for \$10 and \$15 an acre. In short, the question is not the same in the field of agriculture, is not the same as in the field of industry.

Let us look at these things as they are. We do not want to be carried away by revolutionary phrases and hot air. We cannot solve this problem by talking loud and long. We will have to solve it according to experience and the results of scientific research.

However, comrades, as I said, we are dealing with a question of today. I am willing to incorporate a phrase something like what Comrade Clark of Texas suggested. It could be added to paragraph 4, where we are dealing with land and ought to read, "Occupancy and use to be the sole basis for any title." That phrase did not originate with me. That was an old plank I found in the platform of the Knights of Labor; and I think it is a very good clause to add.

DEL. MORRISON (Ariz.): I never thought it would be necessary for me or any one else who is devoted to the cause of revolutionary socialism, to oppose a report like the one presented here by the chairman of this Farmers Committee. I have never supposed that a thing like this could ever possibly occur in a Socialist convention. If it was a Single Tax convention, if it was a Bryan or a Hearst meeting, if it was a Roosevelt Reform Society, or something of that character, I would not be surprised; but to think that you, as delegates of the great revolutionary party are called upon to pass away your time in convincing this bourgeois Wisconsin crowd (laughter drowned balance of this sentence). I am not trying to be smart or anything of that sort; but I want to call your at-

tention to the fact that in the year 1888 the Populists held their national convention in this same windy city, and the same sort of stuff that is interjected here by the chairman of this Farmers' Committee, was covered by the platform of that Populist convention. Is it possible that we have so far forgotten ourselves that we will attempt to curry favor with a few capitalist farmers? Why is this resolution here? What is the object of it? What is the purpose of it? Is it to secure votes? Do you hope to deceive someone as to the actual, real program of scientific socialism? Or are you in other words, going to lie to the farmers of this country in order to secure their suffrage? Are you going to present something to them that you know is not contained in the Socialist program? Can you afford as representatives of this great revolutionary party, to do that which in a few years you will be ashamed of? I say no. And you, when you vote upon this resolution, will answer no, because you will adopt the minority report.

The time is past when we are called upon to play with words, with catch phrases for the purpose of securing the recognition of one petty class here and one petty group there. The time has passed when we should dally with words and phrases. We are called upon to mark out a straight line and follow it, and hew to it, let the chips fall where they will.

DEL. LEE (N. Y.): I desire to speak against the minority report, but I must say at the same time that I am compelled to speak as well,—or at least to vote as well, against the majority report. I don't believe, comrades, after having listened to the reports and to the discussion here today that we would do well to adopt either of these reports. I don't believe we are in a position today to take action upon the question of the Farmers' Program.

In Germany and France and the various countries of Europe, our comrades have given careful study to the agrarian question. They have appointed their committees which have worked for months and for years and have worked out farmers' programs. It has not impugned the revolutionary character of the party in France that they have had a farmers' program, or of the German Social Democracy because they have a farmers' program.

It is right that the Socialist party should know what it is going to do in the matter of the men who work upon the soil and that it should be able to tell them what it is going to do; and I think it is not in place for delegates on either side to charge that the other side is trying to cater for votes. Our Farmers' Programs are only an attempt at a solution of what is going to be the method of handling the land and using it under the Co-operative Commonwealth. I don't think we are ready to answer that question.

I think we ought to have a farmers' program in the real sense of the word, a program of measures in line with our other programs, a program setting forth the measures that the Socialist party is willing to support in order that the wage-working class and the working farmer class may come together for the reorganization of society upon a right basis. Such a program as that I should like to see. Such a program as that we do not have before us in either of these reports, and I, for one, shall vote against both; and if there should be any opportunity for the election of a committee that should study the question, I should be in favor of it.

DEL. KAPLAN (Minn.): I want to say that both sides seem to me to be somewhat in error. When we say "Proletariat of the world, unite!" we do not merely mean the wage-workers of the world. Wage earners and farmers are both producers. If we take the position that the proletariat means only the wage-earners of the world, then we are today hopelessly in the minority, and will remain in the minority, for this reason: We know that between 40 and 50 per cent of the wage workers of the country will never be converted to Socialism. Marx tells us that we have nothing to hope for from the slum proletariat. I am not taking the position that because of that we are to look down upon them. The fact is that in all of our great centers of population all over the country you find a great mass of the wage-earners hopelessly degenerate, hopelessly brainless, hopelessly destitute, as a result of their condition and environment. On the other hand there is what we might call the aristocracy of labor. When the Western Federation of Miners went on strike, some were asking for \$2 and \$2.25 a day, while others were getting \$8, \$9 and \$10 a day,

and these latter ones said that the others didn't deserve any more. There are those two foes to the working class,—the fools who are below and the fools who are up on top, both of whom will never be converted. So, let us recognize once for all that we have got to have the farmer and we have got to have the wage-worker. But we do not want to harmonize with the farmer from the standpoint of a middle class proposition. The farmer must recognize that the dollar question is his question, and that his question is our question. That is what the minority proposition means. Proletarians of the world, unite, upon the basis of the working class emancipation, for the emancipation of working class society.

DEL. THOMPSON (Wis.): I want to speak for the committee. I want to call attention to the fact that this resolution which the majority has reported does not pretend to be a platform. It is simply for the purpose of clearing up one point that is now under discussion. The convention has already agreed to the election of a committee to study this question. That was a part of the committee's previous report, and it is now for the convention to elect such a committee.

I want to say in defence of the resolution of the committee, in regard to the point that Comrade Berger brought out, viz., that occupancy and use should constitute the only real title to the possession of the land. That is what I believe every member of the majority of the committee had in mind,—so much so that if I had gotten the opportunity to offer the amendment, I would gladly have presented it and I believe all the committee would accept it. It is exactly our idea.

We know that there is a very large proportion of the votes of this country on the farm, under agricultural conditions and environment, over 40 per cent. Less than 30 per cent of the votes of this country are under industrial conditions. When we get to the point where we want to do something, we must have some way or other of getting these two forces welded together. We never can win out with 30 per cent of the vote. We will have to have at least a substantial majority, and that we cannot have without the farmers.

DEL. DOWNIE (Wash.): They have talked to you a good deal about

the difference in trustification of industry in manufacture and industry in agriculture. Simons, in his book "The American Farmer," points out the reason why the trustification in agriculture has not taken the same course as it has in manufacture. And why hasn't it taken the same course? One of the principle reasons he points out lies in the fact that the farmer and his wife and his family working together can produce and put on the market farm products in competition with a higher state of production. Now, I ask you, comrades, do you stand for any such condition as this degradation and lack of opportunity on the part of the children of the rural communities. I tell you, comrades, we are just as much opposed to children working on farms as we are to children working in the factories, and we stand to abolish the whole present system of production. Just one more point I want to make, and that is this—we have to take into consideration the different conditions that will underlie future action, as contrasted with the conditions our present action faces. When we get Socialism the conditions will be so changed that it will be impossible for private production for sale to be seriously considered.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is now upon the adoption of the minority report as read. All in favor please say aye; contrary no. The chair is in doubt. A division is called for.

A vote was then taken by show of hands, resulting in 99 votes for and 51 against. The minority report was declared adopted.

The committee was relieved from further duty.

Nominations were made for the Permanent Farmers' Committee and voting deferred until the ballots could be printed.

REPORT OF PLATFORM COMMITTEE RESUMED.

THE CHAIRMAN: When we adjourned at noon, the previous question had been called for on the adoption of the first clause of the immediate demands. Comrades Cannon of Arizona, Cole of California, Work of Iowa, and Furman of New York had spoken on the question when the

chair declared the convention adjourned at 12:30. The question comes on the substitution of the word "collective" for the word "national." All you in favor of substituting the word "collective" for the word "national," signify by saying aye; contrary no. The ayes seem to have it. They have it, and it is so ordered.

Now the question comes upon the adoption of the first amendment introducing the words "and all land" prior to the word "railroads." Are you ready for the question?

Question called for; motion put and carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question now comes upon the adoption of the report of the committee in its amended form.

The vote was taken by a show of hands, and the proposition as amended was adopted by a vote of 102 to 33.

The next paragraph was then read as follows:

"2. The national ownership of all industries which are organized on a national scale and in which competition has virtually ceased to exist."

DEL. BOOMER: I move to amend by substituting the word "collective" for the word "national."

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the committee accept the amendment?

DEL. SIMONS: I would, but I haven't the right to act for the committee.

The motion to substitute the word "collective" for the word "national" in the second paragraph was then put and carried.

Motion to adopt the paragraph as amended was put and carried.

The next paragraph was then read as follows:

"3. The extension of the public domain, to include mines, quarries, oil wells, forests and water power." There being no objection, the section was adopted.

Paragraph 4 was then read as follows:

"4. The scientific reforestation of timber lands and the reclamation of swamp lands, all lands so reforested or reclaimed to be permanently retained as a part of the public domain."

DEL. CLARK (Texas): I have an amendment that I believe will settle

all this controversy. I want to amend it by letting this clause appear at the beginning: "Occupancy and use of land to be the sole title to its possession."

DEL. SIMONS: I will read it with your amendment: "Occupancy and use of land to be the sole title of possession. The scientific reforestation of timber land and the reclamation of swamp lands. Lands so reforested or reclaimed to be permanently retained as a part of the public domain." You will have to straighten that out.

DEL. CLARK: At the meeting of the platform committee it was agreed that something of this kind should go on there.

DEL. SIMONS: It seems to me, as I understand it, that that is superfluous. It is putting the same thing in twice, and confusing the language.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have it now, Comrade Simons.

DEL. SIMONS: It was just as I stated it, as they wanted it.

DEL. HILLQUIT: It makes sense.

DEL. CLARK: The purpose I aimed at was to amend it just as this is. The other was the committee's. I didn't know what the committee might do. I might just say I suggested this as the way I saw to settle it. I make this because I believe it will settle all this controversy that we have had. In the talk I made this morning against the proposition, the clause reported by the committee, I did so for the reason that I took a different position relative to the national ownership and collective ownership of these industries. You might say it is making a fine distinction between these two terms, but the term suits me better. It may be simply a way of qualifying things, but I like the term better, and that is why I make the fight. It may be possible that in taking that position I am an idle dreamer. I want to plead guilty to that fact. I want to say again, I will just answer an objection that was made this morning when I said the dreams that nations dream come true; if more of you men become dreamers we will get along with this better than we do. We have been accused of being Utopian, but I want to say that if you succeed in trying

to poke these reforms down the throats of the Socialists of this country in this convention, you will face a storm in your ranks four years from now, when they attempt to undo it. As far as I am concerned I am sorry that the question of the collective ownership of wooden shoes should have come into the question, but it seems that every time a man gets on the floor and takes a certain position on Socialism he is accused of believing in the collective ownership of tooth brushes. It is preposterous and absurd, and Comrade Simons knew I made no such declaration and said I had no such purpose. Get that clear in your mind. No man that had an eye single to the principle of this statement here would have made that accusation. I stand here for revolutionary Socialism, and I am glad to say that though my position was criticised, I still maintain that position, and any individual who stands for mere reform has no place or lot in a revolutionary Socialist convention. (Applause.) I said that when I came here I came to take the land, and I meant that statement, and that if it came to a point of voting I would vote to down every reform that was proposed in this program, but I say again that I said that for peace and harmony I want to ask you to agree on a program that we could all endorse, but if this convention decided differently I shall stand by it after adoption and I shall support it just as faithfully as any of you when I leave the convention. I stand for that as amended here, and I hope that ends the controversy as far as I am concerned.

DEL. SNYDER (Kan.): I would like to ask, as long as you put a clause as to the land in the first section, why we need to deal with these specializations on the land at all. It seems to me, as long as you amended the clause to include all lands, that you might just as well cut off all the other specializations. I don't see any use in specializing about different kinds of prairie land, etc., as it is all land.

DEL. THOMPSON (Wis.): I want to speak for this amendment, and in doing so I would like to ask the comrade from Texas one question. If I understand the meaning of

this amendment as he now presents it, he wants to make it state that occupancy and use of land is the only title to possession. Do I understand that, comrade?

DEL. CLARK (Tex.): Yes, the basis of title.

DEL. THOMPSON: Now, I want to know from Comrade Clark, do you guarantee under that the farmer in the possession of that land?

DEL. CLARK: Certainly, we guarantee that possession.

DEL. HILLQUIT: A point of information. I would like to know if Comrade Clark and Comrade Thompson have agreed between themselves, what guaranty have they that the co-operative commonwealth will fulfill the promise?

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? (Question called for.) The question is now first upon accepting the amendment that Comrade Clark submitted.

DEL. BAUER (Cal.): I wish to speak against this long-eared amendment. We have just voted and declared for the collective ownership of all land. Now we are going to reverse our position and vest title to land in occupancy and use, which is the old anarchist position; it is not the Socialist position. (Applause, and a voice, "Correct.") I actually thought we had a convention of intelligent men here, but we absolutely go on record for one specific thing, and then the next moment go in direct opposition to the previous position. Where do we stand? Occupancy and use certainly would give private ownership to men who own 1,537,000 acres of land, and the land owned by corporations, merely because they say they occupy and use every foot of that land. Nonsense. We stand for collective ownership, and the title rests with the collectivity. (Applause.) No two-by-four farmer and no financial farmer or anybody else. How are you going to determine what he occupies and what he uses? Are you going to have a special committee to say that you occupy and use so much land? If he chooses he can occupy every foot of land that he wants. That is the old anarchist position and not the Socialist position, and I hope in the name of logic and common

sense you will exercise your intelligence and vote this fool amendment down. (Applause.)

Del. Fieldman of New York moved the previous question, and it was seconded and carried.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS: I rise to a question of information that will keep us from getting into a hole. I want to ask Comrade Clark of Texas if he won't consent to some such arrangement of words as this; otherwise I will say that we are going to have something that will sound rather silly when we get it out. I want to read this just as we have got it, on which we are going to vote: "Occupancy and use to be the sole title of possession. The scientific reforestation of timber land and the reclamation of swamp land. Lands so reforested or reclaimed to be permanently retained as a part of the public domain." I would strike out the first and last clauses. Permit me to make a suggestion that we do this: Pick out the clause and make the whole thing read like this, leaving out part of the committee's report: "4. The scientific reforestation of timber land and the reclamation of swamp lands; occupancy and use of such land to be the sole title to possession." Stop right there.

DEL. CLARK: I am sure the comrades here fully understand the position I am taking in that matter, and if they do we will all agree. The position is this. As to the Wisconsin delegation, or those who vote for the platform as it has been stated, my conception of their position is this: That when we stand for the private ownership of lands as it was embodied there it means that the individual shall own his land privately and be protected by a title from the political state. My position is that he will not be protected by a title from a political state, but from an industrial government, as you have wiped out the national ownership of that land. Understand, you don't vote for that if you know what the difference between industrial and national administration means, from my standpoint.

DEL. SLAYTON: A point of order. I object to any change of the

report of the committee after the previous question has been called for.

THE CHAIRMAN: Objection has been offered, and the vote will be upon the amendment. Del. Hillquit has the floor.

DEL. HILLQUIT: I will ask you to vote against the amendment, and kindly be careful hereafter in voting on the amendment. We do not realize here for the moment that when we adopt this phrase or these words we take something that we must explain for four years more, and something that we may not be able to explain. I think before we make a laughing stock of ourselves we should take the time to consider that the more immediate demands are temporary measures. With the collective ownership of all lands we have mixed up our program, and it will tack this phrase on to something which, first, has no connection with it, and secondly, is an entirely unfounded assumption. What does the amendment mean? Occupancy and use the basis of title to land. How do we know whether the co-operative commonwealth will infer and arrange it in that way? Are we authorized to make that statement? Are we called upon to make that statement? Is it revolutionary, scientific Socialism, or is it an individual solution of anyone who happens to think that we can provide for legal rights in that way? Aren't we taking a long excursion into the domain of the future and into the domain of speculation? It may be true that the dream of the dreamer may become a reality if this dream is the dream of the nation. But we have not come here to dream dreams and leave it to the future to realize them or to show them to be just mere pipe dreams. We have come here for some reason, and I think there is no reason which would justify us in taking this position and making this a part of our immediate demands. The Socialist state may just as well decide upon an entirely different basis for the distribution of land. It may not at all be bound by our resolution here today that occupation and use forms a title. They may have other modes of establishing title or regulating the use of land. We have set forth in our main platform that we stand for the collec-

tive ownership of land, and have stated there plainly, as far as language is concerned, that every foot of the globe should be exempt from the absolute ownership of the people. (Applause.) We have put that in our main platform; then we have put it in our immediate demands; then comes a second demand creating another sort of land. Leave it alone. We have got enough to think of.

DEL. WALDHORST (Ala.): I am for the immediate demands as submitted by the committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then against the amendment?

DEL. WALDHORST: In our platform we declare in one place in the preamble a certain position, and then in the platform proper we state again a certain position, and then we come to the immediate demands which have prevailed in all Socialist platforms, to my knowledge, for the last twenty years, wherever they have had a chance to publish any. Now, in the immediate demands we declare a position against that which we have already stated in the preamble and in the platform. What are we after? If we don't want to state these positions over and over again, then we don't need any immediate demands. What of it? That is all nonsense. Now, any Socialist that will say that the title to land lies in occupancy, I don't know where he got that idea from. I never got any like that. My idea always was that when we get the Socialist state there will be no title to land. Not only that, Herbert Spencer stated, and if you will read his book on title to land, you will find the explanation of my position. I never heard of such a thing. If you want to declare that title to land shall be occupancy and use, that is single taxism and not Socialism. (Applause.) I do not recognize any title to anything except what is absolutely necessary for my personal and individual demands and for my family. And no more do I believe in the collective ownership of a tooth brush that is mine and I own it—or any other proposition of that kind. But I say this: I believe there was and there is no title to any land whatever, and never was. (Applause.) Just the same as it is necessary for me to own my

plane and my saw that I can follow my trade, just as much as it absolutely necessary for the community or the nation to own the land from which and on which they raise the necessities of life. Now, if you go ahead and state these propositions over and over again, then the comrade from Texas better study Marx over, and better study Herbert Spencer and Ruskin, too. I studied them all. I have been at it for twenty-seven years, and I found out I know less now than I did when I started. (Laughter.) But I know this, that the philosophy of Socialism rests on a very simple proposition, and that is that all things necessary to the human race as a social being or a nation or a community must be owned and should be owned by that nation or community or whatever you may call it; the source of it must be owned socially and collectively. The distinction between national and collective is a good deal if you study it. Not only that, but immediate demands are a thing that is permitted by Socialists of all countries. For what reason? To give them a chance to ameliorate the conditions as they exist today and not under a Socialist state. We want to make the conditions so that we can raise the man from down in the slum up to a position where he will be able physically, mentally and morally to understand the position of the Socialist that wants to give him a full chance to enjoy that which we call the joys of life. (Applause.)

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I wish to speak for the amendment. Comrades, I haven't any voice or strength to waste, so I must ask you to listen carefully. I am a revolutionary Socialist. (Applause.) Now, understand that, and please don't take my time in applause. I am simply stating things clearly. I am not bidding for applause; that is not what I want. I am so much of a revolutionary Socialist that I am going to quote with approval the words of Karl Kautsky, who, with Bebel, stands as one of the leaders of the revolution—if you please, the leader of the revolution in the south of Germany. Is that satisfactory?

A DELEGATE: No.

DEL. GAYLORD: That depends

on what you are thinking about. Kautsky is known as a "r-r-revolutionary." (Applause.) I want to read him. He says, "No Socialist who is to be taken seriously has ever demanded that farmers should be expropriated." Do you understand that? This I quote from page 159 of the "Socialist Revolution," by Kautsky.

A DELEGATE: Read the rest.

DEL. GAYLORD: The whole book? No, I haven't got time. I read that a long while ago; that is why I can turn to it so easily. I have given the page, and you will have to take my word. I am making this speech myself, if you please. Now, we have come to the point where we recognize the necessity of discussing and studying this land question. That is a long step forward, and I am glad to see it. I want you to watch the vote in favor of this line of study and in favor of going forward in this way. Some one said here that the German comrades are behind the times. That is very interesting; it is almost cute.

A DELEGATE: You will be, by reading that book.

DEL. GAYLORD: Yes, I should say so.

A DELEGATE: May I ask a question?

DEL. GAYLORD: I am not going to stop till I get through. I am in order, and there is nothing the matter but you. (Laughter.) Comrades, I have not time to read, but I want to suggest to you that you can find three different sets of agrarian or what we call agricultural programs; one drafted by a committee in which Bebel is a member for Northern Germany; another by a committee in which Dr. Quarck is a member from Central Germany; and another by a committee in which Von Vollmar, who is one of the so-called Bernsteinian comrades, is from Southern Germany. I may get them mixed up, but the point I want to make is that in Germany there are three different kinds, just as in this country there are at least three. Coming back to the point at issue, I am not quite clear whether this ought to be put in a separate section or left in this section, and I do not care. But I want it embodied, because it agrees with Kautsky who is revolutionary; it

agrees also with the comrades who are constructive. There are points where the revolutionary Socialists who say it with a "r-r-revolutionary" and those who are constructive, or, if you please, opportunists—there are points where they agree in all the international movement. This is one of the points. Therefore, I want that sentence included in these demands somewhere, and so I am in favor of the amendment. Put it in here, or put it in a separate section, I do not care, but put it in because it belongs there.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor of adopting the amendment will signify it by saying aye. Contrary, no. The noes appear to have it; the noes have it. Now the proposition in its original form. All you that favor the same will signify it by saying aye. Contrary, if any. It is carried.

Section 5 of the general demands was read as follows:

5. The absolute freedom of press, speech and assemblage, as guaranteed by the constitution.

DEL. HOEHN (Mo.): I move to strike out the word "absolute." There is either freedom of the press or there is none. I don't believe there is any absolute freedom, and then freedom.

DEL. SIMONS: I think the word is used there simply as an emphasize. I do not believe that as such it is out of the way.

DEL. ROSS (Okla.): I want to ask Del. Simons a question. What guaranty can you give us that we have got a constitution?

DEL. SIMONS: That is a question for the supreme court.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you any objection to the section as read?

DEL. SLAYTON (Pa.): I would like to ask a question first, and make a remark if I am allowed. Is a motion necessary to do what Comrade HoeHN wanted?

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair would decide that in editing that would be taken care of.

DEL. SLAYTON: Then I want to move to amend by striking out the words that say "as guaranteed by the constitution." I will tell you why when it is in order. (Seconded.)

DEL. FARRELL (Ohio): I would like to ask the delegate from Pennsyl-

vania if he has any words to submit in place of that?

DEL. SLAYTON: We don't want any words in place of it. Will Comrade Simons please read it as it would stand with the words stricken out as my amendment proposes, and I will explain.

DEL. SIMONS: "Absolute freedom of press, speech and assemblage." It is absolutely guaranteed in the constitution in almost those words, and the idea was to have it preserved.

DEL. SLAYTON: I wish to speak on the motion.

DEL. SIMONS: The committee will accept that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then it is adopted. Proceed.

DEBATE ON RELIGION.

Del. Simons read the next section:

6. That religion be treated as a private matter—a question of individual conscience.

DEL. LEWIS (Ill.): I wish to make a motion and speak to it. I move that this part be stricken out of the platform. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved that that part be stricken from the platform. Are you ready for the question? Comrade Lewis of Illinois has the floor.

DEL. LEWIS: Comrade Chairman and comrade delegates: I am among those who sincerely hoped the question of religion would not be raised at this convention. I am willing to concede so far that we shall let sleeping dogs lie. (Applause.) I know that the Socialist position in philosophy on the question of religion does not make a good campaign subject. It is not useful in the propaganda of a presidential campaign, and therefore I am willing that we should be silent about it. But if we must speak I propose that we shall go before this country with the truth and not with a lie. (Applause.) I believe in Socialist scholarship, and I voted to have scholars on this Platform Committee in that sense; men who understand the Socialist philosophy, and we have at least half a dozen men on the Platform Committee who know that the question of religion is a sociological question; it is an anthropological

question; it is a question of chronology; it is a question of economics; it is a question of theosophy. There are few domains of modern thought that do not directly affect the question of religion. And when you say that it is merely a question of private conscience, you fly in the face of the science and the learning of your day. (Applause.)

Now, I do not propose to state in this platform the truth about religion from the point of view of the Socialist philosophy as it is stated in almost every book of Standard Socialist literature; but if we do not do that, let us at least have the good grace to be silent about it and not make hypocrites of ourselves. (Applause.) I have only one copy of this standard, recognized book. I have not access to my library at this distance, and I borrowed it from Comrade Miller. It is Karl Kautsky. He says: "So long as Christianity ruled the minds of men the idea of revolution was rejected as sinful, as a sinful revolt against divinely constituted authority." But you must not go before the people of this country in this campaign telling them that so long as Christianity rules their minds they will reject the idea of social revolution. Oh, no, you must not be revolutionary, Comrade Gaylord; you must tell them they can be good Christians and accept the revolution as not being sinful, but quite in harmony with divinely constituted authority. I say, let us either tell the truth or have the good grace and the common sense and the stamina and the manhood and the self respect to keep our mouths shut about it. Therefore I move that this be stricken from the platform. (Applause.)

DEL. D'ORSAY (Mass.): Comrade Chairman, I do hope that this clause can be stricken out. It ought to be stricken out without any objection, without any discussion. But as Comrade Lewis has said he hoped the question of religion would not be brought up, well, he started it by making the speech he made.

DEL. LEWIS: It was because it was in the platform.

DEL. D'ORSAY: Well, it could be obviated by not discussing it. The question of religion in the highest

sense is a question of individual conscience, and if we would leave it out of our platform altogether the question of religion would adjust itself, and I do not think we have any right to bring up the question of religion in the Socialist platform. And another reason it ought not to be in there is that it is not a demand. If it was and if it had a place anywhere it belongs in our declaration of principles. And I think on the whole question of immediate demands, if we would stick to the general demands and not go into specialization or special positive things, it would be much better. But you see we come in with a certain lot of immediate demands, and then we don't know where we are at. We go into everything, and therefore we must cover every part of the Socialist philosophy.

DEL. MILA TUPPER MAYNARD (Col.): Comrades, are we really anxious to have working class solidarity by the revolutionary victory, or are we anxious to air our special theories of religion or intolerance? Can we seriously say that a movement that must be world wide must accept some particular form of materialistic, monistic, any kind of a negative position, or any kind of a positive position, for that matter? Those of us who are Socialists and who read with reverence and respect the words of a Ferri and a Kautsky, do not quarrel with them because they do not understand religion as we do. We do not take their statements on economic matters and say they are false because they happen to develop a crude and childish idea of God and do not believe in that kind of a god. I say that the German Socialists, the foreign Socialists altogether, so far as I know, all of them, those who express themselves on religion, have a perfectly ignorant and utterly childish notion of modern theological thought, and I for myself have always stated that I stood against any rabid religious position or any kind of religious position or denominationalism, but I do say that I think that modern cosmic theism is as much more profound than this childish monism as can possibly be imagined. The Socialist philosophy is the best bulwark that was ever

made for a genuine cosmic theism. I would not believe there was any divinity or goodness in the world or any meaning in the world if it were not for the fact that Socialism interprets all this great cosmic problem. It interprets it in such terms as are consistent with the thought of a Tyn-dall, with the thought of a Huxley and with the thought of a Spencer. It is absolutely consistent. And when this atheism is made to appear identical with Socialism, those who so try to identify are trying to put an impediment in the way of our progress which is utterly inexcusable. Can we accept the position of the Hindoo? Perhaps not. Possibly if we knew as much as they do we would accept it. But can we accept the position of the Mohammedans? We do not know much about it. But are we going to try to have international solidarity on the basis of some theory or what some other man ought to believe if he don't? I object to people putting up some crude notion that existed a hundred years ago and saying it is the religion of my brother Christians or my brother workingmen who are Christians, and then knocking it down and saying that a man cannot be a Socialist if he accepts it. I believe the people who take this position know neither the philosophy of modern religion nor do they understand the real cosmic significance of Socialism. (Applause.)

DEL. REILLY (N. J.): The Socialist Party has not thus far concerned itself with the particular religious opinions of its members, and consequently I have no pet theories or other views to advertise. But I do say that I consider this plank in our platform of immediate demands as a most unnecessary one, to say the least. (Applause.) I take it that these immediate demands express our views of things that we want to have as steps to the co-operative commonwealth, and I respectfully submit that as far as the government of this land is concerned religion is already treated as a private matter, and there is no use in asking that something be treated as a private matter with the individual when it already is the case. I thank you. (Applause.)

DEL. HILLQUIT (N. Y.): I

move the following amendment. I move, in the first clause read to you, the insertion of this: "The Socialist movement is primarily an economic and political movement. It is not concerned with the institutions of marriage or religion." And I move that after its adoption it be taken out from the program and inserted in the declaration of principles. (Seconded.) The motion has been seconded, and I will say a few words to it. The very fact that there are Comrade Maynard and myself taking absolutely opposite views on religion, she believing in the cosmic theism, I being an agnostic and always having been one, and both of us being nevertheless good and useful members of the Socialist Party, proves to you that religion is not connected with Socialism either for or against it. (Applause.) Yes, comrades, you would make a mistake. The fact that Comrade Lewis as a scholar, as a student of psychology, of history, of ethics and of everything else, has in the domain of religion come to the position of an agnostic and that ninety-nine per cent of us have landed in the same spot, does not make Socialism agnostic, nor is Socialism Christian, nor is Socialism Jewish. Socialism hasn't anything to do with that side of our existence at all. (Applause.) I say to you, Comrades, if we are to follow Comrade Lewis' advice and to say in our platform and declaration of principles what is true, let us not be afraid to insert in it the things we are advocating day after day and on all occasions. The trouble with us is that we have not always the courage of our convictions. I am confident that those who have applauded most emphatically, most noisily these utterances against the adoption of this plank, when they find themselves on the soap box and are asked the question, "Yes, but won't your Socialism destroy religion?" They will answer, "No, we don't agree on it. I personally may not be religious, but Socialism has nothing to do with religion." And to show you how widespread this conception is, I will tell you one little incident. I had the great pleasure of meeting in debate recently a college professor of extraordinary erudition in social science, more than

the average. He said distinctly, "The reason why I object to Socialism is because it is against marriage and religion." And I say to you, we have no right, especially after the subject has been brought up, to leave an impression among the people at large that Socialism stands for these things, for it does not stand against religion, or against marriage. Our comrades in Germany have the courage to say so openly. Let us have the same courage. (Applause.)

DEL. UNTERMANN (Idaho): Comrades, no one will accuse me with any sympathy with Christianity, either as a church or as a religion. I am known in the United States as a materialist of the most uncompromising order. But I want it clearly understood that my materialist philosophy does not permit me to strike this plank out of the platform. (Applause.) I want it understood that my materialist dialectics do not permit me to forget the exigencies of the moment for our ideals in the far future.

The Socialist platform in Germany has carried this very same plank for years, and the man who wrote it was the most uncompromising materialist in Germany, Karl Kautsky. (Applause.) Karl Marx and Frederic Engels surely were known as uncompromising Socialists, and they agreed with this platform. Would you expect to go out among the people of this country, people of different churches, of many different religious factions, and tell them that they must become atheists before they can become Socialists? That would be nonsense. We must first get these men convinced of the rationality of our economic and political program, and then after we have made Socialists of them and members of the Socialist Party, we can talk to them inside of our ranks, talk of the higher philosophy and of the logical consequences of our explanation of society and nature.

I know very well that this plank will be misconstrued into the very opposite of what we want to accomplish by it. I know that those who are opposed to the materialist's interpretation of history, will construe it into a prohibition of the teaching of all materialist philosophy in the So-

cialist movement. But we object to that interpretation, as they do the position of Comrade Lewis. (Applause.) We want to be consistent and conclusive in our teaching. We do not think that we can interpret society and nature analytically and naturally in economics, and theologically in philosophy. We believe that there is only one method by which we can get at all this truth in all the world in all things, and that is by the inductive, analytical method of historical materialism. And therefore we should interpret the facts of history as well as of nature from the standpoint of the materialist proletarian monist, but we should not go out in our propaganda among people that are as yet unconvinced and are still groping in ignorance and obscurity, and tell them that they first must become materialists before they can become members of the Socialist Party. No. This declaration that religion is a private matter does not mean that it is not a social matter, or class matter at the same time. It merely means that we shall bide our good time and wait till the individual is ready, through his own individual evolution, to accept our philosophy. It means that we shall give him plenty of time to grow gradually to the things that are necessary to him, and those material things that affect his material welfare, the economic and political questions of Socialism. After he has grown into them it will be so much easier to approach him with the full consequences of the Socialist philosophy. Therefore, I ask you to retain this plank in our platform.

DEL. CAREY (Mass.): Upon this matter I wish to say as a member of the Committee on Platform, that reference to religious matters and religious institutions occurred in various portions of various drafts that were submitted to us. My personal view was that all reference to such matters should have been stricken out, no matter what my own opinions might be, and no matter what my religious convictions might be. That is none of your business. I do not consider that my religious views have anything to do with the struggle of the proletariat for economic liberty, and because I so viewed the matter,

I deemed it unwise to have the matter brought up, knowing the temper of some of the delegates, and thought it better that there should be no reference whatever to the subject in the platform.

Some of it was stricken out, although some of the members of the committee saw fit to call me a coward for asking that it be not referred to. But we have troubles enough now; I want Socialism. I don't want to force upon the public, or upon the working class, a discussion of some abstract philosophy that will obscure the question of the emancipation of my class. And those who do want to force that discussion may be scientific, but it is not the science of the proletariat. For that reason I say that it is unhappy—and it was not the working class members of the committee who would have it there. It was the intellectuals—the literary men—

DEL. LEWIS (Ill.): A point of personal privilege.

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrade Carey must be permitted to speak his mind. He has the floor.

DEL. LEWIS: The comrade pointed directly at me.

DEL. CAREY: Excuse me; I didn't mean you. (Laughter.) It is unfortunate that when I sweep my finger round the hall some place in the inclusiveness of this space is occupied by Comrade Lewis.

This is all I wish to say. Unfortunately this subject was brought up. It was unwise. But we must now act upon it. I say now pass this declaration that religion is not a public matter; my religion is no concern of you; yours is no concern of mine. That the subject was brought up was unhappy; but it is here; and I believe religion to be a private matter. I have a right to believe in the existence of a Heaven or a God. I am as good a Socialist, so far as I am concerned, as I can be. Therefore I shall vote for the adoption of the part which declares religion to be a private matter, although I believe it was unwise on the part of the committee to force us into a discussion of the matter, a matter that tends to obscure the issue in which I am interested, the abolition of economic tyranny, and the

emancipation of my class from industrial exploitation.

DEL. FARRELL (O.): While the previous speaker spoke in opposition to the amendment he spoke in favor of the adoption of the resolution as submitted by the committee. I want to say that I am here to speak in favor of leaving out the whole thing, and in opposition to both the resolution and the amendment.

It is my personal experience that the question of religion brought into our movement by the enemies of Socialism has tended to retard our movement more than any other question. On top of that I want to say that the resolution in my opinion was bad enough, but the amendment submitted by Comrade Hillquit in my opinion is ten times worse. I want to say to you that in my humble opinion the time has arrived when this question of religion will serve to retard the Socialist progress in far less degree than it has in the past. I want to say to you that in my opinion the best thing you can do is to vote down both the resolution as submitted by the committee and the amendment of Comrade Hillquit. Cut out the question of religion altogether.

I know that there have been men of practically every denomination known on the American continent in my local and the question of religion has been discussed, and it has not benefited us one bit. What we are here for is Socialism, for the emancipation of the working class, and eventually of the whole human race in the industrial field. I say to you then that it has been easier in the past for the speakers and agitators for Socialism to answer the opposition when they brought in the question of religion simply to say that Socialism has nothing to do with religion. Now let us continue along that line. I hold that if the matter is left in the program in that way it will tend to intensify the argument on religion, and in that way will tend to divert the discussion from the real issue and delay the emancipation of the working class and the emancipation of the race.

For those reasons I am opposed to both the resolution as submitted by

the committee and the amendment, and I hope this convention will be prudent and wise enough to vote down both of them.

DEL. BROWN (Wash.): Probably I shall not use all my time if you give me your attention.

A DELEGATE: I hope not, Brown.

DEL. BROWN: I thank you.

We cannot afford to evade anything as scientists. It is no answer to say that this is something with which we want nothing to do. If we mention a question, if the question is put to us, we have something to do with it as Socialists. As scientific Socialists if you cannot face the gun and answer the question you have no business upon the platform.

Now, as a matter of fact, we have something to do with both religion and with marriage. But our religion, in so far as we have to do with it, is our own individual private business. If any Socialist believes that the Socialist philosophy does not deal with the question of marriage, let him look at the 600,000 women in this country who would love to be married.

DEL. STRICKLAND: The question before us is not understood by the speaker. The question of marriage has been taken out.

DEL. BROWN: I accept the correction. I didn't know it was taken out.

The question of religion is a personal, private matter. It has something to do with the question of Socialism inasmuch as those people in this country who believe that the triumph of Socialism will destroy their religious beliefs should be disillusioned. Their minds need our attention. Because as a matter of fact we know that a person must almost necessarily be a Socialist in order to be a real Christian in spirit. (Cries of "No!" and "Yes!")

The question is, shall we evade the issue by leaving it out of the platform, because you do evade it by remaining silent now. By recognizing it and analyzing it you do not evade it. The question is, can you afford to evade it?

DEL. STRICKLAND: The proposition is shall we wipe out Kautsky with Kautsky. The statement made

by the platform committee is a sentence from Kautsky. It is quite in order to wipe it out with another sentence. The sentence just before is this: "The arguments against revolution are derived from the present ruling forms of thought. So long as Christianity ruled the minds of men, the idea of revolution was rejected as sinful revolt against divinely constituted authority."

Now, comrades, you will notice if you consider that passage closely that the word Christianity is not used in any primitive sense, or with any reference to its origin or its revolutionary beginning, but with reference, comrades, to the Christian institutions, organized Christianity.

Now, comrades, listen; you may say that you will avoid this question. You may say you will not take it up. Very well, then, I serve notice on you that whether you do take it up or not, you will have organized religion to meet.

Comrade chairman, I want to refer to a passage on page 110 of Dietzgen's "Philosophical Essays": "We have found that religion and Social Democracy have this in common—look out, this is not a preacher talking; this is the man whom Marx called the 'Socialist philosopher.' I read it again: 'We have found that religion and Social Democracy have this in common, that they both strive for salvation, yet Social Democracy is in this respect more advanced in that it does not look for salvation in the realm of spirit, but in the world of material realities, taking the human spirit only as its god.'"

If we have a common social origin, if both religion and social democracy have a common social origin, and if economic determinism be true, and if the moral and ethical principles of society be based ultimately upon the manner of economic production, how dare you then say that we have nothing to do with religion.

Please note that if we dodge this issue today, it will come up at another time. Go to the history of the movement in Dubuque and inquire there, as to why there is no local paper there of the Iowa Socialists, and why the movement was cut in two in one year, and they will tell you only by

referring to certain acts of a religious organization. We already have this issue to meet, and I am in favor of the adoption of the committee's report because we ought to dare to make that declaration in the face of an official interpretation of Christianity rather than its original—for remember, comrades, according to Osborne Ward, Christianity carried the red banner of the working class for three hundred years.

I favor the adoption of the committee's report and am opposed to the amendment.

DEL. ELIOT WHITE (Mass.): Your ideal is to be perfectly free from prejudice. As scientific Socialists you are perfectly free from prejudice. I will start by saying that some of you may not know that I am an Episcopal minister in good standing in my church. Let me say next that although you are all free from prejudice you think you know just what I am going to say. Now, if I can show by what I do say that I am saying what you did not expect you will acknowledge, won't you, that you have a little bit of prejudice against me as a minister.

I am in favor of dropping this whole thing out of the program. I don't think you expected me to say that as an Episcopal minister. I think if the Democrats and Republicans can leave that out of their platforms—why, in the name of common sense do we need it in ours?

I want to object to what has been said on this floor about one of the speakers and the motives that have been imputed to him. I refer to Comrade Lewis. It has been said here that he stated that a good Socialist could not be religious. He said no such thing. I consider that his position was well taken, and his statements well made, and I stand for everything he said.

Now, here is another queer thing about me as a preacher. I have an idea that it might be a good plan to have in this platform the statement that no discrimination should be made by Socialists either for or against people on account of religious or non religious beliefs; and you may think that the reason I say that is because I don't want atheists or infidels, so-

called, to keep out Christians. But it is not that. There is more than one place where atheists and infidels are kept out by so-called Christians.

A DELEGATE: Will you offer that as an amendment to the amendment?

DEL. WHITE: I want it let alone. Cut it all out. We have here a movement that we can stand up for, that we can stand in and be of it, and witness for its truth. If people don't like it they will have to dislike it. (Applause.) You should not keep on petting people to become Socialists. You can't do it. If they can't become Socialists because of their manhood and womanhood don't try to pet them into becoming Socialists. They have got to find it out for themselves. I am sorry for some of my old bigoted Christian friends because they have so much to learn, and it is going to be a hard road for them for the next twenty-five years. Christianity is up against the biggest crisis it has ever faced—the Reformation and everything else included—Christianity has its biggest crisis to face, it is in the greatest danger of going to pieces as a formal institution, that it has ever been in. I am perfectly frank to say to you that Christianity as some Christians understand it today is bound to go under, has got to go down. But that is merely White's personal opinion, and the next Christian may say that is nonsense. That is White's opinion; he holds his opinion and I hold mine.

But in the name of common sense let us chisel out any mention whatever of religion from one end to the other; preamble, platform, demand and everything else. In the words of a previous speaker, "Let sleeping dogs lie."

DEL. DEVINE (Ohio): On this question I find myself in a position in which none of the previous speakers has been. Therefore I sought the privilege of getting a chance to speak to you. I find myself in this position. Since I have been in this convention I find myself one of the few who are actively engaged in factories. I also find myself one who must take issue with a sentiment that is gaining in the Socialist movement, and one who must take issue with

something that was said upon this floor last night. I want to say right here that we must be careful upon this question. I stand here today as one actively engaged in the factories, and trying to get my co-workers into the Socialist movement. I find there men of all religions; I find there men of all kinds. I am asked by one class of men: How can I be a Catholic and a Socialist? I am asked that by Catholics. What I am does not matter. They don't know. You don't know. The question is: Is it anything to either of us what the other is or believes on religion? I am asked by the Catholic how can I be a Socialist and a Catholic? Now, I want to be in a position where I can harmonize those things. Therefore I want this—I have taken this opportunity of making this point in particular. I recognize that the church has taken an attitude against the Socialist party. I know of a comrade in the factory who was refused absolution because he was a Socialist. It seems to me I am forced to take the position I do today so that I can keep that comrade in the Socialist party, not so much for his vote as for his strength. That is what we are after. So I say that we should put nothing in our platform whatever; I am in favor of striking out entirely any reference to any religious position that the Socialist party takes.

DEL. HUNTER (N. Y.): The reason I wish to have this plank in our platform is because I wish this question settled, so that everybody in the party can have absolute freedom to say what they please on this matter as a question of individual conscience, and say with authority that this political party takes no religious view whatever. You know why the plank was put in the platform of the German party. For years and years the reactionaries of Germany went about trying to divide and keep divided the working class. How? By saying: "That is the party of atheists and agnostics." They are trying that in every part of Europe. They are trying it everywhere. Bebel is an atheist, and he campaigned for atheism, but not as a principle of the political party, but simply as a man, as a known Socialist expressing his own

individual opinion. When the people in Germany came forward and said, "Your party is a party of atheism and agnosticism," the other comrades wanted that statement in there to prove that charge false. In other words they wanted to settle this question once for all; to keep it out of the discussion. When I go—or somebody else goes—I very seldom go—to deliver a Christian lecture, and somebody says, "See what Lewis says," or "See what Bebel says," I want something like this proposed statement that is authoritative, not my own individual view, but the formal statement of the position of the party, that we as a party consider this matter to be one of individual conscience. The fact is plain that we are being attacked upon this question. It may or may not have been wise to bring up this matter at all, but if we vote it down, what will be the inevitable result? It will be taken to mean that we do not consider it a matter of individual conscience, and that we desire to adopt views antagonistic to those who hold certain religious views. It will be so considered.

Now I say that we have to face more and more serious fighting upon this question. The debate on this religious question is going to become more and more heated. I believe there is a church in this country which is going more and more to attack Socialism upon this very point. I don't want to have to discuss it. If someone rises and presents the views of Bebel or Lewis or some one else and says: "Look; these men hold these views, and they are leading Socialists," and I say, "I don't hold those views." "Well," they say, "these are leaders in your party, and you don't express the view of your party." Then you pull out the platform and show the party position in the matter. There is the declaration of principles; not that we believe in any religious view. I want the atheists in this party; I want all the Lewises, all the fellows who are fighting for the cause of the proletariat; we need every man—every man, no matter what his religious views. Let each man hold his own view; let him talk as he likes as an individual; but

don't let him go about and say that this political party is a party of Christians, or a party of atheists, or a party of agnostics; let them all talk Socialism. Let them have their beliefs; let them say that this economic doctrine is in harmony with atheism; if that is their individual belief; let others say that it is in harmony with Christianity if that is their individual belief; let us have absolute freedom, take no position on the matter of religion whatever, and prove to all who would attack us on this ground that it is a matter of individual conscience; that it is a private matter with which the party has nothing to do.

I support the plank as brought in by the committee.

DEL. STIRTON: I have tried for some time to get an opportunity to express the hope that this whole matter would be stricken out. I want to call attention to the fact that no effort has been put forth or is being put forth to place the Socialist party in an attitude of hostility to religion. I do not do that; and we do not want that. All we want is to have this whole matter stricken out. And for this reason, first of all. If this statement is true that religion is no concern of our movement as stated in the amendment or in the original recommendation, that it is a private matter—if that is a true statement, then we don't need it. If it is a lie, then we don't want it. That is what I have striven to get the floor to say that those who take this position are not taking an anti-religious view. I was a Christian once; I am an atheist now; but that is neither here nor there; we are not trying to put a religious or an anti-religious plank in the platform. We simply want it out.

In reply to the position taken by one of the comrades who stated that in the German Declaration of Principles they have this plank, I want to say that there is an essential difference between our situation in Germany and in the United States. In Germany they have a recognized state church, as there is in England and in other countries, and there such a declaration of principles might come in with a certain degree of propriety as showing that they were favoring the

disestablishment of the state church. But here there is no state church.

I am opposed to this proposition because of the implication that would be drawn from it. The comrade said that we did not want it interpreted this way and that way. I am opposed to any declaration in our principles or resolutions or platform which puts us under the necessity of sending an explanatory treatise along with it. I am opposed to it.

There is another thing. I am intensely and bitterly opposed to this statement being accepted as the declaration of the Socialist party for the very reasons which Comrade Hunter set forth as reasons why he supported the resolution; and that is that it is a sop to a certain element; a sort of apologetic utterance for the fact that many of our leaders choose to be atheists. I don't want to take the Socialist platform—I don't intentionally do it—sometimes a word may fall from me in the heat of discussion when I think what I have suffered from the ecclesiastical institution that calls itself Christianity—I don't want to have to make apologies, and say—

THE CHAIRMAN: The delegate's time has expired.

NAT. SEC. BARNES: Since the question has been opened up, I hope that a large number of the delegates will be privileged to participate in the discussion. I believe we are going to declare right today. And I hope that the previous question will not be voted so as to prevent any comrade who has any light to throw upon this subject from doing so.

To begin with, I believe it was entirely unnecessary to put this in the platform at all, or any place else since it is sufficiently covered by the constitution. But since the subject has been injected into our proceedings, and in view of the character of the discussion here, and as it will appear in the public press and be quoted from our official records, I am now and for these reasons in favor of the committee's original report.

These scientists who are only utopians I want to call to book. Let us assume that all religions sprang originally from the material interests of the people. Still can you say that religions in all their varieties that are ex-

tant in the world today are primarily and now based upon the manner in which the people who believe in them obtain their livelihood?

Cries of "Yes" and "No."

NAT. SEC. BARNES: That is utopianism. Suppose we agree further. So far as we know, fire was first produced by rubbing together pieces of wood. Must we therefore say today whenever we mention fire that it is connected with rubbing together pieces of wood? The Indians have their heaven, their happy hunting grounds, and they associate their means of livelihood directly with their belief. And looking back through the ages I presume that our original religions were thus brought into existence. Since that time we have developed our industry has become diversified, and our opinions have been distributed over a great realm of purely mental effort or activity, but altogether remotely connected with the manner by which we make our living. Now we are concerned with the conditions of today. And the religions of today are very remotely connected in civilized countries with the ways in which we make our living.

veloped faculties and sentiments and I want to say in conclusion, since this question has been injected and since the discussion has proceeded as it has and along the lines that it has taken, it will be quoted throughout the length and breadth of this land, to the detriment of our work if we do not make the right decision. I think it is right and proper that we should say as the committee has said that it is a matter of private opinion and personal belief.

DEL. HERMAN (Wash.): I am opposed to both the amendment and the original plank in the program. We are all agreed that sugar is sweet; we are all agreed that vinegar is sour. Why are we all agreed? We are agreed on those things because we know as a matter of fact that sugar is sweet and that vinegar is sour. If science means anything at all, it means that we are convinced that a certain thing is correct. In order for a position to be scientific, it must first be based on fact. Therefore, I say that all these sneers cast at science are superfluous. We should dis-

cuss this question upon its merits. We do not insist that any one should be an agnostic or an atheist before they are allowed to join the Socialist party as some of the comrades have suggested. We do ask that a man or woman shall understand something about the Socialist movement before they be allowed in the Socialist party. Comrade Untermann has said—

DEL. UNTERMANN (Idaho): I rise to a point of order. The point is that I am misquoted; I took exactly the stand the speaker is taking.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point is well taken.

DEL. HERMAN: The question is this: we do not need this kind of plank in our platform. Our constitution states our position relative to religion and relative to race and relative to nationality, and relative to sex. We don't need to have planks in our platform for any kind of religion you may believe in, or stating what kind of religion you shall believe in, or what kind you shall not believe in, or stating that you shall have your own conviction on this question. Surely we have a right to our own opinions on these matters. I have a right to my opinion but I do not ask as an agnostic that we state our position with regard to agnosticism. I do not ask it. I do not ask that we state our position in regard to atheism. I demand that we remain silent on that question. So far as Christianity is concerned—yes, we are opposed to Christianity—

Cries of "No, no."

DEL. HERMAN: Why? Because the church is the organized expression of Christianity.

DELEGATES: That is not true.

DEL. HERMAN: Christianity is organized in the church, and that is the only kind that we have the right to recognize. Where does the church stand? Does it stand with the wage-working class. Does it stand with the proletariat or against it? As a church, I mean? Where does John Pierpont Morgan stand when he goes before the country and says that Socialism would destroy religion, that Socialism would destroy the home; I ask you, has he been excommunicated from his church? Is not the Catholic church a Christian institu-

tion? The church is the organized expression of Christianity, and they are opposed to us, the wage-working class; they are lined up with the capitalist class and are fighting with the

capitalist class, helping them to keep in slavery the proletariat of the United States and of the world.

On motion the convention adjourned until 7:30 p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

Chairman Bandlow called the convention to order at 7:30 p. m.

THE CHAIRMAN: The proposition before the house is the amendment to the report of the Platform Committee bearing upon the question of religion being a private matter.

The previous question was ordered.

DEL. LEWIS (Ill.): Let me make this statement. I have gone into conference between the afternoon session and evening session, with most of the members of the Platform Committee, and I have reached an agreement with them which I am sure the convention would be glad to hear, and it will dispose of this question, I think, amicably to all concerned. (Applause.) I would like to have the floor on that for about two minutes. I think the members of the Platform Committee will agree.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there are no objections.

DEL. LEWIS: Comrade Chairman and Comrades: I will preface my remarks by saying that I consider myself and every other delegate on this floor as being present at this convention for the sole purpose of promoting the best interests of the Socialist party. (Applause.) I am willing to waive any personal views of mine, and I believe the members of the Platform Committee are in the same position, to promote those interests. Since this convention adjourned, I have been able to get into conference with Victor Berger, with Morris Hillquit, with Comrade Work and as many other members of the Platform Committee as possible. I agree with the sentiment expressed by the National Secretary that while it might have been better to have left this question out in the beginning, now that it has been introduced, to withdraw this question altogether would put us in a false position, or at least render us open to false representation by the capitalist press. (Ap-

plause.) And so, while it may not harmonize with my personal opinions to have this plank remain in the platform, I am willing to sink those personal opinions rather than put the Socialist movement of America in a false position and lay it open to the attacks of our enemies, who are always seeking some opportunity for misrepresentation. (Applause.) The only thing I was afraid of in this No. 6 as it appeared in the program was this: That such a declaration might be interpreted as limiting free speech on the Socialist platform, and that it could be misused to say that a Socialist speaker on the Socialist platform shall not be allowed to expound the materialistic conception of history as it is expounded in the classic literature of the Socialist philosophy, and I maintain that anything that is good enough for our standard books ought to be good enough for our platform, and I wish to keep free speech open on that platform. I find that there is a unanimous agreement with that position among the Socialists who have been elected by this convention to the Platform Committee, and so if the Platform Committee will give me an assurance that will go into the stenographic report of this convention that it is not the intention that this plank shall be used to limit free speech on the Socialist platform, so that it will leave it possible for Comrade Carr, or Comrade Bentall, or any of the Comrades in that group to argue Socialism from the point of view of Christianity, I am perfectly willing they should do that, if I may argue Socialism from the point of view of materialism and some other man may argue Socialism from the point of view of atheism or agnosticism, or whatever may happen to be his point of view; that this argument in favor of Socialism shall be from the individual point of view or any man on the Socialist platform, irrespective of what his religious or anti-religious opinions may be, so long as his argu-

ment conforms with the classic position of Socialist philosophy. If that will be preserved with this plank in the platform, then I am willing that the plank shall remain, and I am willing to vote for it and ask those comrades who loyally supported my position this afternoon to go with me in support of that plank in that platform. (Applause.)

DEL. KNOPFNAGEL (Ill.): A point of information. I want a point of information from Lewis. I want to find out who has given him the right to put himself above the party. He has no right to agree for us. We can adopt anything we darn please. Whatever the delegates accept, we accept. We don't have to have any assurance from him.

(Much confusion on the convention floor.)

DEL. LEWIS: I speak only for myself.

DEL. KNOPFNAGEL: Whatever the delegation accepts is adopted. You don't have to give it any assurance.

THE CHAIRMAN: The delegate will be in order.

DEL. LEWIS: I am pledging only my own vote. I am not pledging the vote of any other delegate to this convention.

DEL. KNOPFNAGEL: You can vote against it.

DEL. LEWIS: I am requesting those who agree with me on this position to vote with me in this matter, because I believe that to so vote is to the best interests of the Socialist party of America. After all, you will do as you please.

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrade Slayton has the floor. For or against, Comrade Slayton?

DEL. SLAYTON: I am against the plank as it stands in the committee's report, and I am going to briefly tell you why.

Someone said, on the floor, that these beliefs that we may hold concerning the supernatural origin of things have nothing to do with the struggle of the workingman for a living. I emphatically deny it. If I had a congregation, and could make them believe that they who were producing the wealth of the world were in the situation of life that the Al-

mighty Creator intended that they should be, do you suppose for a moment they would get up and resist the conditions they found themselves in? No, wouldn't they be perfectly satisfied, and couldn't my exploitation go on, and could I not lead them, even with their consent, if they believed they were occupying the position that they were destined to fill? It stifles revolt. A man ceases to be a rebel and becomes like a young robin, willing to accept anything the old bird brings, whether worms or shingle nails.

I shall try to illustrate by drawing the parallel of the Indian and the buffalo, and by a materialistic interpretation show you the application of that parallel to the workingman. The Indian, when the buffalo was plentiful, imagined that the Great Spirit put the buffalo there for his sole use. When the grass got short and the buffalo migrated, so did the Indian, and the Indian imagined that the Great Spirit was displeased. He couldn't see that there was any material reason for it. Of course, the buffalo left because the grass got short, and the Indian left because the buffalo left, and because he was dependent upon the buffalo for his food—a material proposition in both cases.

When the workingman gets out of a job, he goes and hunts another, as the Indian hunted the buffalo, and when the workingman finds a job, he thanks God that he has found a job just as the Indian thanked the Great Spirit that he found the buffalo. Just exactly the same principle applies to both, the parallel is absolutely perfect.

DEL. SPARGO: Mr. Chairman, I feel called upon to raise a point of order that the delegate is not discussing the propriety or impropriety of including that statement in our platform, but he is discussing the philosophical questions involved.

DEL. SLAYTON: I can show their relation, if you will permit me.

DEL. SPARGO: I raise the point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair must rule that it is impossible for him to put into the mouths of delegates words that refer to the questions at issue. If a delegate does not make

the best use of his time, that is against him. (Applause.)

DEL. SLAYTON: Right you are, but I am going to make use of it before I get through. If Comrade Spargo will listen he will see that the application to the Indian and the buffalo is perfect. If these things are true, if they act socially as well as individually, and if they act for the whole tribe of Indians as well as one, and if they be a fact, then every relation or every effect or every religion is the reflex of economic conditions. It is the social reflex and has its effect on society as any other effect acts upon society. (Applause.)

That being the case, religion becomes a social affair and not an individual affair. As for the program just laid down, that is the point that I want to make; when the tribe left, that was social, and it looked to the Great Spirit for interpretation. That is the point in issue. If you do not want to lay it on the party, then leave out the plank, and then it is an individual affair as to whether he shall or shall not interpret it or try to interpret it as he pleases. But if you put it in there, you recognize the religious question and allow the other fellow an opportunity to force you on the defensive, by the very recognition of it. Leave out the plank and you can show the platform and say that we are not taking part in that matter, except as the other fellow raises it; but if you talk pure economics, nine times out of ten he does not raise it at all. (Applause.)

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): Comrade Chairman and Comrades: As a member of the Platform Committee, I am one of the sinners responsible for this discussion; in fact, I am THE sinner. I am the man who suggested it. Like George Washington, I can say that I have done it with my little hatchet, so to speak. (Laughter.) And I am willing to own up.

It is not a question as to whether religion is right or wrong. We are not to discuss that question here. However, it is a condition that we are up against, and not a theory.

In the first place, a plank of this kind you will find in every platform or program of every other civilized nation in the world. Yet in no country

do they have as much reason for it as in this country. There is not a race in the world that is as thoroughly religious as the Anglo-Saxon race. If you want a party made up of free-thinkers only, then I can tell you right now how many you are going to have. If you want to wait, with our co-operative commonwealth, until you have made a majority of the people into free-thinkers, I am afraid we will have to wait a long while. (Applause.) I say this, although I am known, not only in Milwaukee, but wherever our papers are read—as a pronounced agnostic.

However, comrades, this is not a question as to whether every other comrade agrees with me in my views on religion. It is a question as to whether he agrees with my views on the economic question. That is all I am asking for. (Applause.) I am not to ask my fellow workman whether he is an agnostic or a Roman Catholic, or a Protestant, or a Presbyterian, or a Jew; I am simply to ask him whether he is a Socialist. (Applause.) That is the only position we can take.

Now, the church is with the capitalist class, without doubt, especially the church per se, the Roman Catholic Church. That church has always sided with the class in power. That church was with feudalism as long as feudalism was in power. On the other hand, as you well know, all the great philosophers of the Eighteenth century—Rousseau and Voltaire, and the others—the men who opposed feudalism—were pronounced atheists. The church was on the side of feudalism, while feudalism was on top, and the church now sides with capitalism, because capitalism is on top. The opponents of the ruling system must naturally expect the opposition of the church. And the church butts up against the same thing that it did a hundred years ago. In my home town, in Milwaukee, since we had an open discussion in the newspapers with Archbishop Messmer—now at the head of the Roman Catholic societies of the United States—from that time on, there has been a constant agitation against all Socialists as Atheists. You can hardly find a paper in which we are not denounced as men who want to abolish all religion and

abolish God. Something must be done to enable us to show that Socialism, being an economic theory—or rather the name for an epoch of civilization—has nothing to do with religion either way, neither pro nor con.

DEL. VANDER PORTEN (N. Y.): Comrade Chairman and Comrades: Nobody regrets more than I do that this question has arisen in this convention, but, as long as it occupies the position that it does, I believe that if there is to be any expression upon it, that expression should be the truth and not a lie. (Applause.) I am opposed to the adoption of the committee's recommendation and I favor the amendment on the ground that, as long as we are too cowardly to express what we believe, we should be silent entirely. (Applause.)

Is there a man who will dare to say that religion is not a social question; that it is the question of the individual; that the Socialist movement is not involved in it? When we talk of being scientists and of science, and when we know that science and religion do not mix, are we a body of men who recognize the need of studying and legislating for the social, political and economic welfare of the ignorant, down-trodden of the lower strata of society; or, instead of that, are we an organization of vote getters who would straddle everything? (Applause.)

We must talk in tones that cannot be misunderstood when we talk at all, or we must remain silent. I am in favor, at any and all times, of speaking what I think and endeavoring as nearly as possible to think what is right and truthful. (Applause.) When we turn to religion and religious institutions, we can look back into the Dark Ages and see our ancestors, our antediluvian ancestors, in their caves and holes, looking to the supernatural and the superstitious. But when we talk of educating mankind and when we talk of raising mankind above the level in which he is, then we have got to throw from his arms those crutches that bind him to his slavery, and religion is one of them. Let it be understood that the moment the Socialist party's whole aim and object is to get votes, we can get them more quickly

by trying to please the religionists and those whose only ambition is to pray to God and crush mankind. (Applause.)

I have listened with patience during the many debates that have taken place in this convention. I have listened with patience and indulgence to the many straddles of important issues that are vital to the cause of Socialism and the progress of the human family. I have seen those straddles, and I have seen things that have seemed to me entirely unnatural in a Socialist convention, but I have remained silent. But I can no longer still my voice and allow it to go on. Let us say nothing or say the truth. To spread forth to the world that religion is the individual's affair and that religion has no part in the subjection of the human race, we lie when we say it. (Great applause.) The Socialist party has reached a stage where it has come to the turnpike, and will either have to stand for the truth or declare for opportunism of the barest kind and invite anybody and everybody to give us their vote, irrespective of the importance of the views that they hold on economic slavery.

DEL. CLARK (Texas): I rise to a question of personal privilege. My position was this: That, not being at the meeting of the committee when they framed the immediate demands, I had nothing whatever to do with the insertion of that plank or any other of the reform planks in that platform. I informed the committee, when I left, that I would not touch any reform that would go into that platform, that I was opposed to the idea of religion, but on the other hand I advocated a statement, in the declaration of principles, that the church was on the side of the capitalist class.

DEL. SOLOMON: I rise to a point of order. If Comrade Clark disagreed with the Committee, it was his business to bring in a minority report.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair holds with the point of order.

DEL. SIMONS: We cannot, we dare not, and we do not want to touch any question as vital as this question that is before us tonight. We are not going to be allowed to touch it. Already the battle is being fought within

and without our organization upon this question. Comrade Berger held a paper in his hand which he intended to read, containing a speech of David Rose, delivered on the 4th of this month, not in campaign time, and filled almost from beginning to end with bitter denunciation of the Socialist party on the ground that it was a party of atheism, a party of agnosticism, a party simply of anti-clericalism and against the church. That simply showed that today the capitalist class is using the institutions of religion as it is using the institutions of government, for the purpose of class rule. And even the institutions of religion have turned themselves over to a man that is the creature of the disreputable resorts of Milwaukee, in order to be used to beat down the workers in their election struggles. So I say to you that we cannot touch this question. At the same time, let us remember that because capitalism uses the institution of religion just as it uses the institution of the state, we have no more right to declare that there shall be no religion and that a man shall not have a right to stand where he pleases on religion, than we have to declare that we propose that there shall be no state, that we shall destroy the state or not use the state at this time. Do not misunderstand me in using that analogy. We do not ask to reach out and use the church for our purposes, for we could not use it. But we say that while religion exists, and it may exist forever—for let me tell you, there was a time when I was just as sure on all the principles of Socialism, on all the principles of religion and on all the principles of atheism. I have changed from one to another sometimes in my life, but I am not quite so sure now of all those things as I used to be. I am now truly an agnostic in science, in religion and in Socialism. (Applause.) I do not know it all, but I want to know it all, and I believe that every comrade with me has a right to want to know and to work out his own investigation.

And so a religion which has survived savagery and barbarism and feudalism and well through capitalism, is not going to die tomorrow because

here and there we spell God with a little "g" and sometimes hurl our darts at it; don't forget that. (Applause.) And while that exists we have that right. I won't say that Comrade White, for instance, is not just as sincere, hasn't got just as good a brain as I have and isn't just as sincere in his belief that within his system of thought he can reconcile the materialistic principles of Socialism, the demand for the class struggle, with his religious notions, as I am that he cannot. If Lord Kelvin could reconcile his scientific knowledge—and he stood at the head of the scientific men of the world—if he could reconcile his scientific knowledge with religion, it is not for me to rise to such a tremendous height as to say that he was a fakir, or deceived. (Applause.) So I ask you to take this plank announcing that we hold religion to be a private matter.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question now is on the amendment.

DEL. COWAN (Ohio): I want to ask a question. Is the Mayor of Milwaukee of more importance than the President of the United States, that he must be answered through this plank and the other through a special letter?

DEL. LEWIS: Three members of the Platform Committee, before this session, promised to give me the pledge that I asked for in this speech. Two of them have used up their time without having done so. Now, I ask for this information.

DEL. SPARGO: I raise a point of order, that no three members of this convention can give any pledge that will bind the Socialist party. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is on the acceptance of the substitute offered by Delegate Hillquit.

(The question was put, but the result being in doubt, a show of hands was called for, and the vote resulted in 79 for the substitute and 78 against, and the substitute was declared carried.)

DEL. VANDER PORTEN (N. Y.): I rise to make a demand for a roll-call upon that question.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair will not entertain a motion of that character.

DEL. VANDER PORTEN: I appeal from the decision of the chair.

THE CHAIRMAN: The result of the vote had been announced.

DEL. VANDER PORTEN: I raise a point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: State your point of order.

DEL. VANDER PORTEN: That the chair has no right to render that decision.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is in accordance with the rule provided.

A DELEGATE: Move to reconsider.

DEL. VANDER PORTEN: I withdraw the appeal and make a motion to reconsider.

Delegate Brower also moved to reconsider.

Seconded.

Delegate Spargo moved to table the motion to reconsider.

Seconded and carried.

Delegate John M. Work, of Iowa, filed the following explanation of his vote on the question of religion: I was in favor of the spirit of the substitute, but I voted against it because I wanted an opportunity to vote in favor of the original report of the committee. Doubtless others were in the same position. That probably accounts for the closeness of the vote on the substitute. As my name was brought into the discussion by Comrade Lewis, and I tried in vain to get the floor, I wish to say that while I certainly do grant every comrade freedom of speech on this subject, both inside and outside the movement, I nevertheless very seriously question the wisdom of those anti-religious comrades who insist upon dragging their irreligion into their Socialist speeches and writings. They have done the Socialist cause an immense amount of harm. I utterly repudiate the assertion that in adopting that plank we adopted a lie.

On the contrary, we adopted the literal and unqualified truth. Socialism is not concerned with matters of religious belief. If Socialism causes any changes in religious opinions, it will be merely because of the fact that Socialism will elevate the human race to a higher plane of existence where it can discover and grasp new truths. And, in that day, the opinions now

held by agnostics, atheists and materialist monists are just as likely to be overturned as are those of any religionist. The idea that Socialist principles lead to agnosticism, atheism, or materialist monism, is false.

PROGRAM CONTINUED.

DEL. SIMONS (for Committee on Platform): We now proceed to the industrial demands:

"7. The improvement of the industrial conditions of the workers:

"(a.) By shortening the work day in keeping with the increased productivity of machinery."

Adopted without objection.

"(b.) By securing to every worker a rest period of not less than a day and a half in each week."

Adopted without objection.

"(c.) By securing a more vigorous inspection of workshops and factories."

Adopted without objection.

"(d.) By forbidding the employment of children under sixteen years of age."

DEL. CANNON (Ariz.): The laws in most of our capitalist states do have a declaration for sixteen years of age, and I don't think that such a resolution has a place in a Socialist convention. I move to amend by making it eighteen years of age. (Seconded.)

DEL. SIMONS: The committee wishes just a moment. I appreciate your desire to get through. The committee took a day to consider that. The comrade is very much mistaken in his statement. I might say there are, I think, but two states in which that is true, instead of nearly all of them.

DEL. JOHNS (Cal.): I do not think the objection of the comrade applies very strongly. There are similar objections to all the other planks. I think we better adopt all of these, and at the end there probably make a statement that will fix the thing all right, and not make the Socialist party ridiculous by having something the same as in the platforms of other parties. I favor adopting that clause along with the rest.

DEL. MARGUERITE PREVEY (Ohio): I want to speak in opposition to the amendment offered that

the age be made eighteen. We as Socialists fully realize that you cannot legislate the child labor problem out of existence. We fully realize that as long as we have the capitalist system where the father of a family does not get wages sufficient to support the whole family, the children must go into the shops and factories to earn a living, and that they can't be kept at school until sixteen. We are doing very well, as the legislation against child labor at the present time is not effective because the parents of the children must decide whether the child shall go without the necessities of life, or go into the factory, and the mother has to decide to let the child go into the factory in order that the child may have the necessities of life. That is a condition that you cannot legislate out of existence until the head of the family gets the full product of his labor. I am opposed to the amendment for that reason. Don't let us make ourselves ridiculous. We should understand the child labor problem better than to apply such an amendment to this proposition.

DEL. HOLMAN (Tex.): I am opposed to that clause in the immediate demands. If that clause would say that we oppose child labor and make a provision then so that the state should clothe and care for the child, then I would be in favor of that clause. But to make no provision for it, seems really worse to me than the mercy of the capitalist class in employing them so that they may get food and raiment. If they will have it that the state shall make provision to take care of the child and feed, clothe and educate it, then I am for the resolution; otherwise, I am against it.

DEL. CANNON (Ariz.): Mr. Chairman and Comrades: On this question of child labor, I am no theorist. I have had the practical experience, and if I make any mistakes in the statement that I am about to make, I call on the delegates from the anthracite coal region of Pennsylvania to contradict me. Comrade Prevey here spoke and said that the poverty of the father and mother compelled the child to go to work. I know the poverty is there. I was

born and raised in poverty. In fact, I have never been able to get out of that poverty. But the point I want to make is this: Before I was nine years of age I became a wage-worker, and I have not been able to get out of that class since. I have tried many expedients, and finally I have been driven into the Socialist party, to get not only myself out of that class, but to get men and women and children of the future ages out of it. The same argument that Comrade Prevey advanced against making the age limit eighteen years was used against making it ten years, twenty-five years ago. (Applause.) The same argument was advanced against making it twelve years of age in the state of Pennsylvania twenty-five years ago. The same argument was advanced a few years ago when it was made sixteen years. Now, I realize that it is very little when we just raise that limit two years, but I want to point out to you that a child sixteen years of age is not yet matured, and that the young body with its unformed bones is not able to be in this struggle for existence and mature properly so as to become one of the future citizens of the United States. The child is not responsible for the poverty of the father and mother through which the child was driven into slavery too young. (Applause.) I agree with another comrade here who made a remark that this is no place for the declaration. Instead of putting in an age limit of this kind at which the children shall go to work in the capitalist society, let us put all our energies into getting Socialism, and never mind any of those immediate demands. And then your program about which we have been quarreling all afternoon and evening is nothing but a farce (applause), for every declaration you have made, the enemy are going to make one of their own, and just as radical, and they will make much more capital out of it.

DEL. KORNGOLD (Ill.): I really did not know there were so many impossibilists in this convention. (A voice, "One more.") You just found it out. If we are going to wait until we get Socialism, and if we are going to leave the child in the factory until

we get Socialism, then I am not a Socialist. (Applause.) You may talk of it as you please, I am not willing to do so. I am not willing to leave the children to starve in the factory, to let them work their bodies to mere skeletons until we have established the co-operative commonwealth. This is all very well in theory, but it does not work in practice. You ask the child in the factory whether he is willing to wait until you get the co-operative commonwealth and see the answer he is going to give you. (Applause.) The child in the factory will be more grateful to the cheap reformer who is going to get him out of that factory hell than to the impossibilist Socialist who is going to make conditions all right after a while, when the child is completely ruined, and comes to the co-operative commonwealth when he is about ready to die of consumption. This is the kind of policy a working class party stands for, is it? I am ashamed for comrades that will applaud such sentiments. There is not a Socialist party in Europe or anywhere in the world which stands for any such impossibilist tactics, and I hope you will not stand for it. (Applause.)

DEL. MOORE (Pa.): Comrade Chairman: I come from the State of Pennsylvania, and I want to call your attention to impossibilism. Four years ago, at the behest of the trade unionists, we got a law adopted in the State of Pennsylvania prohibiting the employment of children under eighteen years of age in the bituminous coal mines. It was scarcely on the statute books before the district of Pittsburgh of the United Mine Workers of America passed a resolution denouncing the law. I have here to back up what I say a member of the United Mine Workers of the State of Pennsylvania, coming from that district. Now, if you want impossibilism, go ahead. You who come from Wisconsin and talk practical Socialism should take notice.

DEL. KORNGOLD: That is not the question.

DEL. MOORE: I don't care, I am addressing my remarks to all you impossibilists who label yourselves practical Socialists. (Applause.) I am telling you the fact that none of

your theoretical ideas, none of the assertions as to Kautsky, Bebel and Marx can get around. I am giving you a fact. I will tell you, I believe that Comrade Clark in this delegation knows that when we some twenty years ago got a law prohibiting the employment of children fourteen years of age in the State of Pennsylvania we were driven out of the coal regions, and the very same argument was used then that is used now. Now, if you want to go on as the comrade over there told you, go on putting practical planks in your platform, but there is not a politician, no matter who he is, a Hearst, a Bryan or a Roosevelt, that can't beat you out. Go ahead and do it. Let me call your attention to another one of the practical Socialists. Theodore Roosevelt, they say, put into the laws of the United States a child labor law for the District of Columbia, that excepts out of its provisions every child that is employed in the District of Columbia, but is a model in all other respects so far as the mills and mines—that don't exist in that district—are concerned. Now, if you want to go on with your impossibilism, go on.

Del. Konikow moved the previous question, and it was carried.

DEL. WOODYBY (Cal.): Now, what I say I am going to say very calmly and dispassionately. There is a question before us as to whether this convention should adopt any immediate demands. I believe that we should, and I believe it for this reason: In my judgment, the time is coming when the Socialist party will go into power in some large city and in some of the states of the union, and they will do that long before they get in power in the nation. Let us suppose that in the last election in the city of Chicago the Socialists had carried the city and got the entire administration. Now, I am going to ask you whether the Socialist party in the city of Chicago would have felt itself under obligations to do anything to relieve the workers in the city of Chicago. If they did, it would have to be done on the plan of immediate demands. (Applause.) Let us suppose that the Socialist party got control of the State of Illinois, and they may do that in many of the states of the

union long before they get control in the United States. It is true in Germany; it is true in some of the European countries where they have had control in some parts of the country for years. Now, then, suppose they get control, will they attempt to use the state machinery so far as capitalism will allow them to use it for the benefit of the workers? Would the workers in the city of Chicago, in power in the city of Chicago, attempt to operate any of the municipal franchises? Would they? Or would they say with you gentlemen who are waiting for the setting up of the co-operative commonwealth, "No, we will not do a single thing. We will run the city of Chicago just as it is now being run until we can reach out and get it all." I tell you that I believe this is the line that we will have to take upon this question of government ownership. No Hearst party, Republican party, or any other party is going to declare in favor of government ownership without paying for the franchises. I am for the Socialist party declaring in favor, as fast as they can get in possession in any locality, of taking everything without a cent of compensation, and forcing the issue as to whether there is to be compensation or not. (Applause.) I take the ground that you have already paid for these franchises—already paid more than they are worth, and we are simply proposing to take possession of what we have already paid for. Well, you say the courts will defeat us. All right, let them defeat us if they will. We will throw the responsibility for the defeat on the capitalist parties that defeat the thing. Another thing; I don't know a great deal about what is being done over in Wisconsin, but my notion of it is that in Wisconsin they are doing things, understand. I believe in insisting on taking everything in sight, understand, as fast as we can get it. Another thing: I don't know a European nation, including Germany, France, England, Holland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and all the rest of the countries, but what has a municipal program. They go farther than that; they even start co-operative institutions under the direction of the Socialist party. Listen, we can't af-

ford to wait for the alleviation of the suffering of the people. We must do it as fast as we can get in charge.

DEL. GOAZIOU (Pa.): Comrade Chairman and comrades, I am against this proposition, the same as I am against every other proposition in the immediate demands. (Applause.) Not because I am against preventing children going into the factories, but I am against trying to get votes on immediate demands. I am in favor of trying to get all the votes we possibly can on Socialism, and not on immediate demands. (Applause.) I know we have in this country a growing movement among Socialists who are wanting votes no matter how they will get them. They are willing to put in appeals to the farmers, appeals to the middle class, and appeals to everybody, so that they can get votes. They will get votes sometimes, but whatever they get of non-Socialist votes on this and other demands of the same kind, the result will be that they have in France at the present time, of Millerandism and a whole lot of the same evils, and anarchy following this, a growing anarchistic movement as the result of immediate demands. As Comrade Moore has told you, in the State of Pennsylvania we have people outside of the Socialist movement who are willing to do all that is possible to be done to shorten the hours of labor. It is not necessary for the Socialist movement to spend its time passing resolutions in favor of sixteen, eighteen, or twenty years. These are reform movements that other people will be well able to attend to without the Socialists spending their time about it. Some of the comrades here speak as though they were going to be in power tomorrow and be able to give us all we desire in the way of immediate demands. I hold that whenever the Socialist party gets so strong in power that it will be able to do something that will be of permanent benefit to the working class, we will be able to get Socialism and not immediate demands. (Applause.) And so long as we are not sufficiently strong and sufficiently in power to get Socialism, then the capitalist class will be in control and will allow only what

they wish to allow so as to prolong the present system.

DEL. MORRISON (Ariz.): I have not asked for one word in this convention until now, and you know we lawyers don't say much, anyhow. (Laughter.) I am opposed both to the original and to the amendment, sorry as I am to say it. As highly as I esteem my comrade, whom I love as a brother, Comrade Cannon, I am not in accord with him in his amendment, and of the two I would rather have the original, and I will tell you the reason why. My comrade told us about his early days and about how he worked. Well, I think I can tell you something, too, comrades, of early struggles. Left alone in the world when I was nine years of age in the frozen regions of Minnesota, I wished to know something about the world and went to work in the iron mines at eleven years of age. I think I know something of what it is to bow my neck to the taskmaster. And I will say, comrades, if I hadn't had a chance to work until I was eighteen I would not have been here to bother you with my voice, and I would have starved to death. Unless there should be some provision in that, that we are going to have the power to feed these poor devils that can't work, we had better shoot them. Then again, there ought to be in there a provision that no man shall ever get married till he is eighteen. I know a great many that got married before. Or, that no girl should get married. I think it is a preposterous thing unless we have some provision for support. Of course I expect to see Socialism ushered in tomorrow morning, and I know, since I have had a chance to have my say before this convention, it will be sure to come in. But now, we ought to look fairly at this. We have most of us graduated from the low primary class, and I object as a Socialist and a Socialist worker, one who is willing to give his life and everything to the cause—I object to going back into the primary class. You have graduated, and I say, let us leave such things out. Let Willie Hearst and Bryan put them into their platforms if they wish, but for God's sake don't force me to go back.

DEL. MILLER (Colo.): Comrade Chairman and comrades, there are some of our friends who are very much opposed to the sweet bye and bye people among the Christians. There are others

among the Socialists who certainly belong to the sweet bye and bye because they don't propose to do anything now. (Applause.) You and I who believe in doing things, who believe in telling the attitude of the Socialist Party toward the working class as you go down the highways and stand on the street corners of this country, we have something more than word of mouth as a justification for what we have to say. We want to be able to put our hands upon the official declaration of the party and say, "This is the attitude of the Socialist Party upon this question."

Some of the comrades tell us that we can do nothing until we have captured all the machinery of government. The men who have kept their eyes on our comrades abroad know that is not true. They know that since the English workmen have turned their attention to politics and put their men into parliament, instead of sending polite petitions up there, that the Taff-Vale decision has been reversed. And the comrades who have been taking part in the working class politics of Europe know that there are not more than one-third as many men injured in the coal mines of England that there is in Pennsylvania. They know that there are not more than one-sixth the accidents upon railroads controlled by the state that there are in our own country controlled by private corporations. What is the use of getting so far away from the truth? It is time that you scientific fellows should pay some regard to the actual facts in industrial life.

My friends, child labor is a curse in this country, and everybody knows it. Why should not the Socialists declare their position upon that question? Don't you realize perfectly well that with the working class in power we should not have the courts continually sending out their injunctions? Don't you realize that a million Socialist votes this fall will make many laws constitutional that have been held to be unconstitutional before? Don't we know that the capitalists as we march steadily on are going to grant more and more of the demands of the Socialist Party? Let us agree definitely what we want, for remember what we want now we are soon going to take.

The laboring people of this country have just about reached the position where they are going to stop making

dividends for the capitalists and are going to make history for humanity.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is upon the adoption of the amendment to the motion. All in favor of substituting the word "eighteen" for the word "sixteen," will say Aye. Those opposed, No. The Noes seem to have it. The Noes have it. All in favor of adopting the report of the committee as read will signify it by saying Aye. Those opposed, No. The Ayes seem to have it. The Ayes have it; and it is so ordered. Proceed Comrade Chairman.

DEL. SIMONS (Reading):

"(e) By forbidding interstate transportation of the products of child labor, of convict-labor and of all unsupervised factories."

THE CHAIRMAN: There being no objection that section is adopted.

DEL. SIMONS (Reading):

"(f) By abolishing official charity, and substituting in its place compulsory insurance against unemployment, illness, accidents, invalidism, old age and death."

DEL. COLE (Cal.): I move a substitute. Although it may seem a small matter I do it for this reason: our platform is supposed to be a sort of lesson for trades unionists who are looking for hints. This matter of insurance brought up in this clause is about the same as the Bismarck State Socialist idea, which tends to draw on the small salaried workman, and make him pay out his small salary in insurance for himself; and thus take it out of the little workingman. It does not in any way help him to get a bigger salary, nor does it take anything from those who are exploiting him. My substitute is along the line of the Socialist philosophy. It is this:

"By pensions for the old and infirm, the funds for such pensions to be raised by general taxation."

You understand, of course—I admit I do not always make myself very clear; but the idea is that these pensions shall be paid out of the national treasury in the same manner as the pensions for the widows of soldiers are paid. You do not tax the soldier as according to this proposed clause you would tax the worker. You compel him to pay out of his salary the pensions you propose; but you do not tax the soldier. My substitute provides that those pensions shall be paid out of general taxation of all

the people who have property, thereby taxing a little from those who have been doing the exploiting. Although we may not get the power at once to put this in force the working class may take a lesson and may put it in force finally by their demands.

The motion was duly seconded, put and lost. The original section was adopted.

DEL. SIMONS (Reading):

"8. The extension of inheritance taxes, graduated in proportion to the amount of the bequests and to the nearness of kin."

A DELEGATE: Will the chairman of the committee explain to us what that means?

DEL. SIMONS: That has been in since 1888.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT: Time it was going out.

DEL. SIMONS: It means that the tax would increase by gradations; say nothing up to one thousand dollars; five per cent on \$10,000; 25 per cent on \$100,000; 50 per cent on a million; and so on, until we have the whole of it above a certain sum.

THE CHAIRMAN: There being no objection the section is adopted.

DEL. SIMONS: The next section is Section 9. (Reading):

"9. A graduated income tax."

THE CHAIRMAN: No objection? It is adopted.

DEL. SIMONS (Reading):

"10. Unrestricted and equal suffrage for women; and we pledge ourselves to engage in an active campaign in that direction."

DEL. WINNIE BRANSTETTER (Okla.): I just want to call attention to one part of it—

DEL. SIMONS: You want to call their attention to this pledge to take up active work?

DEL. BRANSTETTER: Yes.

DEL. SIMONS: It is recommended by the Women's Committee, and recommended by the Platform Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to this section as read?

DEL. HILLQUIT (N. Y.): There is an omission here. A slight grammatical or rhetorical omission. It should read "for men and women." I don't believe that as it stands now: "Equal suffrage for women," it makes any sense.

DEL. SIMONS: That is right. It is in the original draft.

THE CHAIRMAN: There being no objection it is so ordered.

DEL. SIMONS (Reading):

"11. The initiative and referendum, proportional representation, and the right of recall."

THE CHAIRMAN: Any objection? Adopted.

DEL. SIMONS (Reading):

"12. The abolition of the Senate."

THE CHAIRMAN: Any objection? Adopted.

DEL. SIMONS (Reading):

"13. The abolition of the veto power of the President."

THE CHAIRMAN: Any objection? Adopted.

DEL. SIMONS (Reading):

"14. That the National Constitution be made amendable by majority vote."

THE CHAIRMAN: I hear no objection. It is adopted.

DEL. SIMONS (Reading):

"15. Government by majority. In all elections where no candidate receives a majority the result to be determined by a second ballot."

THE CHAIRMAN: Any objection?

DEL. GOAZIOU (Pa.): I am opposed to the adoption of that last clause. If I understand it right, it is the second ballot, as they have it in France.

DEL. SIMONS: Yes.

DEL. GOAZIOU: It seems to me if you want to open the door to all kinds of fusion and confusion that is all that we need here. It has been the cause of the greatest trouble in France—more than anything else. While the Socialist Parties of France have a straight ticket on the first ballot, if they don't elect on the first vote they have been continually fusing with whatever party was next to the Socialist Party, and trying to help this friend and that friend, and that is just what Gompers says: Help our friends and fight our enemies. There can be no doubt that it has caused more dissatisfaction in the Socialist Party of France than anything else, due to the effect of this second vote, that is the fusing with the radical parties after the first vote had failed to elect. I hope you will not adopt that section and say that we are in favor of that sort of thing in this country. We shall have lots of chance of

fusion without getting a second ballot. I move to strike out that clause.

DEL. STREBEL (N. Y.): This is the first time I have taken the time of the convention. I do not desire to delay you more than a moment. I believe a matter of such great importance to the movement should not be decided here tonight. This is a matter for the entire organization to carefully consider throughout the country, and therefore I am in favor of striking this out, and sending this matter to the various locals for them to give it serious consideration; and after arguing it from all sides they can come back here four years from now ready to decide whether or not we desire to adopt this measure. I believe if that course is followed we shall have a better understanding of the question and shall be able to vote more intelligently upon it. I am therefore in favor of striking out this clause.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded that the section just read be stricken out. All in favor will say Aye; those opposed, No. The Ayes have it; it is so ordered.

DEL. SIMONS (Reading):

"15. The enactment of further measures for general education, and for the conservation of health. The elevation of the present bureau of education into a department, and the creation of a department of public health. Is it clear what that means? Cries of "No" and "Yes."

DEL. SIMONS: We have a department that takes mighty good care of hogs. But we have no department to take care of human beings. This is an attempt to make the government take at least as much interest in men and women and children as it does in hogs. The other proposition is to extend the bureau of education into a department which will be ready—perhaps this will suit our friends who want Utopia—which will be ready for the co-operative commonwealth when it comes.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection the section is adopted.

DEL. SIMONS (Reading):

"16. The separation of the present bureau of labor from the department of commerce and labor and its elevation to the rank of a department."

THE CHAIRMAN: No objection? It is adopted.

DEL. SIMONS (Reading):

"18. The free administration of justice."

That is a demand for an abolition of the fee system.

THE CHAIRMAN: No objection? It is adopted.

DEL. SIMONS: That concludes the report with the exception of a single sentence from the other platform.

DEL. HILLQUIT: Did you read the clause on the unemployed?

DEL. SIMONS: It was adopted. This is the clause I wish to read:

"Such measures of relief as we may be able to force from capitalism are but a preparation for the workers to seize the whole powers of government in order that they may thereby lay hold of the whole system of industry and thereby come into their rightful inheritance.

There being no objection, the clause was considered carried.

DEL. FIELDMAN: I think the chairman has failed to report an immediate demand dealing with the unemployed problem.

DEL. SIMONS: That we agreed to put—

DEL. HILLQUIT: That is the one I was asking you about.

A DELEGATE: A point of information. Wasn't there a clause about the election of judges?

DEL. SIMONS: I thought I read that. (Reading):

"17. That all judges be elected by the people for short terms, and that the power to issue injunctions should be curbed by immediate legislation."

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection?

DEL. VANDER PORTEN (N. Y.): We have before us now the proposition of the unemployed, and the proposition last read that all judges be elected for short terms, and the power to issue injunctions be curbed by immediate legislation. I wish to move that we amend that clause by making it read "that the power to issue injunctions shall be taken from them." I mean the power to issue injunctions in its entirety.

The motion was duly seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: Moved and seconded that the section be amended by making it read, "that the power to issue injunctions shall be taken from them." All in favor say Aye. Opposed, No. The Noes have it. The motion is de-

feated. If there is no objection the section is adopted as read. The next business is the section in regard to the unemployed.

DEL. SIMONS (Reading):

"We pledge ourselves to the following program: We demand immediate government relief for the unemployed workers by building roads and canals, by reforesting of the forest lands, by reclamation of arid lands, and by extending other useful public works; that all workers employed on such works shall be employed directly by the government under an eight hour working day and at the prevailing union wages. The government shall also loan money to the states and municipalities without interest for the carrying on of public works, and it shall contribute to the funds of labor organizations for the purpose of assisting their unemployed members, and shall take such other measures within its power as will lessen the widespread misery of the workers caused by the misrule of the capitalist system."

I wish to speak to that proposition. I move its adoption.

DEL. FIELDMAN (N. Y.): I have a substitute, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Suppose you let Comrade Simons speak and then present your substitute.

DEL. FIELDMAN: This has been thrashed out all day.

THE CHAIRMAN: You might agree with Simons after he gets through.

A DELEGATE: He might agree with the substitute.

DEL. SIMONS: I wish to make an explanation. I have kept out of several of these debates. I have let things go that I was opposed to. I just want to make it clear to you that this is a comprehensive plan. It does not go into details; but leaves those to be worked out by those who may be in power. We are not going to be in power; and the only way in which we can force action on such a matter is by piling up such a vote that they will give it to us in fear that we may take more. We have enumerated a few things that could be done; but we have not attempted to say how they shall raise the money; we have not attempted to go into small details, as to financial administration, or

any of those things which belong to the capitalist class to decide. We have put in this clause the idea of contributing to the unemployed fund of the unions, which is taken from the program in Belgium, and which practically gave over to the organized workers of Belgium through their own organizations the power to control the funds for the unemployed, and thereby to control that army of the unemployed which is the most powerful army that is used for suppressing the power of labor.

A DELEGATE: Is this to be in place of what we have been voting on in this convention?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, it is in addition.

A DELEGATE: At what place is it to be placed in the platform?

DEL. SIMONS: I believe it was put at the head of the demands. Comrade Hillquit, what was to be the position in the platform?

DEL. HILLQUIT: I think it ought to go at the very first because it is the most urgent matter at this time.

DEL. FIELDMAN: I have a substitute which I wish to offer and I would like to have the secretary read it, and thus save that time and get the benefit of it in discussing this matter.

ASST. SEC. REILLY (Reading):

"The government shall employ every willing worker, their hours and wages to harmonize with the scales established by organized labor for similar work. Our government by the right of eminent domain shall take over such property as may seem necessary to promote the general welfare, build, equip and operate railroads, own the postroads, mines, factories, and provide any other useful work sufficient from time to time to employ all who need and apply for work; that all work be paid for by the day, and no work be let out under private contract; that all money needed to put into effect the foregoing with all accessories needful for their successful operation be provided by congress in harmony with the United States constitution, which reads (Article I, Sec. 8): 'Congress shall have power to coin money and to regulate the value thereof.' All money issued for this purpose shall be full legal tender and paid by the national, state and municipal governments direct to the workers for services rendered. The na-

tional government to extend credit to the state and municipalities at cost. That marketable products be sold to consumers at the cost of production and distribution, and that the price to the public for services be practically the cost of maintaining and operating the same."

DEL. FIELDMAN: I move that this be substituted for the proposition offered by the committee.

DELEGATES: Second the motion.

DEL. FIELDMAN: We write the platform not for ourselves alone, but for those who understand us; but nevertheless if we desire other men who are dissatisfied with existing conditions to join us, it is up to us to explain to them the remedies that we offer in such language and in such terms and with such clearness and detail that they will understand us and that they may thus see that there is really no difference between them and us.

A great deal has been said here tonight against immediate demands. If a platform were written for socialists alone we could sum it all up in one sentence, "Down with Capitalism; up with Socialism." But because we address ourselves to those who do not understand us, but who, if they did, would agree with us, it is necessary for us to so write and construct our pronouncements and platforms that they will grasp our aims, and so unite with us in crystallizing them.

And it is because the recommendation of the committee is couched in such language that you and I understand it, but the outsider would not grasp the full meaning of it, that I object to it in the first place; and it is because the report of the committee does not particularize sufficiently to make the question clear enough that I object to it in the first place; and it is because the committee provides for only one kind of work, and that is outdoor work, and everybody does not want to work outdoors, and in the third place I object to it because the committee does not show how it is to be done, when it can be shown clearly how it can and should be done—I object to it—and in the fourth place it is impractical because it does not explain the details that could be and ought to be explained; and I object to it because the substitute not only makes the question clearer, but it explains how these demands can be carried out in

harmony with existing laws, and for those reasons I stand for it from top to bottom. If I only had the time to compare it—how much more time have I?

THE CHAIRMAN: Your time will be up in one minute.

DEL. FIELDMAN: I hope and I promise that there are very few going to take the floor on this question, because I think it is very simple and I wanted to compare it paragraph by paragraph—but I shall submit it to you with pleasure after you have heard the author of this proposition.

Take the first clause: "We demand immediate government relief for the unemployed workers." Now I think this better: "The government shall employ every willing worker."

A DELEGATE: What is the difference?

DEL. FIELDMAN: There is an important difference. "Their wages to harmonize with the scale established by organized labor for similar work." That explains it in detail fully. Let us go further. "By building roads and canals, by reforesting the forests, by reclamation of lands, and by extending all other useful public works."

Now I want to say that this is far better: "Our government by right of eminent domain shall take over such property as may seem necessary to promote the general welfare"—"promote the general welfare" is taken from the constitution of the United States, which proves that it is taken out of the laws of this nation, already recognized and enforced.

Furthermore: "By building and equipping railroads and owning postroads." "Postroads" is taken from the constitution also, which shows that the government of this nation has the power to maintain roads, whether it be highways or railways—

THE CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.

DEL. RYAN (Ore.): I move that the time of Comrade Fieldman be extended.

DEL. FIELDMAN: I have worked all week on this thing. I have spent nights and days on it.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved that the time of the speaker be extended. Those in favor will say aye; those opposed, no. The ayes have it, and the time of the speaker is extended. Comrade Fieldman will continue.

DEL. FIELDMAN: I thank you. I have given a whole week to this proposition.

We want the government to engage in every kind of work. This substitute provides that we take over for this purpose not only the highways themselves, and the railroads, but the factories, or whatever other useful work may be necessary from time to time to employ all who from time to time need and apply for work.

"That all work be paid for by the day, and that no work be let out under private contract." Now you see here it is laid down that that is just outdoor work. It says "such work shall be directly done by the government under an eight hour working day, at prevailing union rates." I want not only the prevailing union wages and hours, but all the union conditions in every industry according to the regulations of the unions engaged in that industry.

Now we come to the second part of the report of the committee.

"The government shall loan money to states and municipalities without interest." The committee does not show us where the government has got the power to loan such money. We want the people to know that the government has the power to do these things constitutionally, and lawfully. This report does not show that. But here in the substitute on the other hand it is shown very clearly that all the money needed to carry into effect the foregoing with all accessories needful for its successful operation be provided by Congress in harmony with the United States constitution, which reads, Article I, Sec. 8: "Congress shall have power to coin money and regulate the value thereof." This is taken from the constitution, and every American citizen who reads this, every American working man and working woman who can read and understand, or who comes in contact with this, will see from this that the government has the power to coin money; that the government may use that power in order to take over such work, and that that will make it possible for the government to employ every willing worker in the country; and that is what we are after.

We have got to make the American people understand that this government has the power now, constitutionally, if it wants to, to take hold of that work.

It is by comparison that we arrive at the truth. I only learn the truth or teach it upon the basis of contrast and comparison.

I want to reach my fellow man. I want to show him not only what is to be done, but how it is to be done. When I convince my listeners that this government of the United States has now the legal constitutional power to take over these industries that shall make it possible for this government to employ all the working men and working women so that they will not be forced to idleness—when I convince my listeners that the government has that power now—then I show them that the only reason the government does not use that power is because the capitalist class are in possession of the government. Then they will understand that if they will put the men of their own class in possession of the government, then that government will be used in their interest and they will soon see also that there is no need for unemployment, and then they will join hands with us and the Socialist Party will go on to victory.

DEL. DAN WHITE (Mass.): I support the substitute. I do this because while I yield to no man in my desire for the Socialist Revolution, yet I do believe in engrafting a plank of this kind in our platform. There is absolutely no abating one single jot of our enthusiasm for the overthrow of capitalism. But we have gone on year after year during this period of industrial activity through which we have passed and we have said to the workers: "There will come a time when circumstances over which you hold absolutely no control, will draw you into an industrial breakdown." We told them that; and they laughed at us. But we knew it, because we were students of economic conditions. The industrial breakdown came. During that period we never told them when they asked us: "What will you do?" other than to say, "We will capture first the powers of government and then usher in the new era by breaking down capitalism, and we shall benefit the workers thereby." Those were our words or words to that effect. Now that is not sufficient. Those who might be termed impossibilists here, and I think truly termed impossibilists, are talking about the triumph of Socialism. They want it. So do we. But they will never get it until doom

cracks if they go on in the way they have been going. We cannot secure the aid of the working class in capturing the powers of government unless we can give them something tangible, something that will respond to their immediate interests. Unless you can do that, to go to them is useless. We must be opportunists at least to that extent, if we would awaken the working class to an interest in the Socialist philosophy. Down in Massachusetts we have been through the development stage. We understand that it becomes absolutely necessary to lay practical propositions before the workers. We have been successful in some cities in electing part of the city government. We have been able to enforce an improvement in conditions. We have been able under the authority of the municipality to broaden the scope of municipal activity, but whenever we did that they threw back the burden upon the workers by increased taxation, which in the final analysis they were forced to pay, and that taught us to do something different from what we were doing; and we found that it was absolutely necessary to make practical demands. In the neighboring towns around Brocton in Massachusetts they have been successful to some extent in developing the socialist vote, if we do not say its philosophy; but all the time the private capitalist interests in those towns are being importuned to go into Maine or into New Hampshire. They say "Take our idle factories and we will give you freedom of rent, abatement of taxation, all those things that will enable you to come down here and cheapen your production," and thus it is within the power of the capitalist class to desolate any city or town of this country today under the private ownership of industry. With a plank of this character going out and appealing to the working class, they would respond. I say again we want those to come to the Socialist movement who are not yet Socialists, and once having commenced to vote the Socialist ticket they would gradually begin to understand our philosophy, and they will evolve just as the majority of us have evolved to the position we occupy today. I believe that is one good step in the direction of interesting the workers by putting this plank in the platform of the national Socialist Party.

DEL. HURST (R. I.): I do not

wish to appeal to your sentiments or your propensities. I want your intellect. I want your thinking apparatus, that crowning jewel which man possesses above the brute and which makes him its superior. That is what I am appealing to during the five minutes, which is far too short for my purpose. I want to say to you that during this crisis, during the hardships which the people are now undergoing, they are asking the question which they ask of our national organizers and our speakers everywhere: "What can you do if we give you the power? How can you do anything? The capitalists have all the money. What can you do?" Does anyone answer that question? No. I say the question should be answered. Has Comrade Hillquit answered that question? Has Comrade Simons answered it? True, he has with his pen given a scientific evolutionary method of evolving from this system into the other system, but they have not answered this question and they never will until they offer a fundamental proposition like that embodied in this document. I say this question should be answered and I say the Socialist Party is the logical party to answer it. Who else should answer it but the revolutionary party of the people?

This proposition does answer the question clearly. It provides not only a possible but a scientific and probable means of transition from the capitalistic system to the co-operative commonwealth. That I can sustain on this platform against any of your superior intellects, and I would be glad to have the opportunity. It is constructive. It begins where you are. If I wish to get to that door I cannot take the second step first. If I am a common-sense man I must take the first step first. I will not attempt to do anything else first. This starts from where you are and enables you to go from the present system to the co-operative commonwealth. It puts it so plain before you that he who runs may read and understand, whether he be a Socialist or not. It is so plain that we believe you are going to vote for it.

It is revolutionary. What do you mean by revolution if it is not complete change? This will bring about a change methodically and thoroughly and efficiently and there will be no resisting

it and it will be absolutely irresistible in its march. It is utterly revolutionary if there is anything revolutionary. It is a class conscious proposition, absolutely so. There is nothing in it, nothing which can be read into it, which would imply that any other class under any conditions could extract anything out of it but the class who do the work. It is a class conscious proposition from which no other class can extract anything except those who do the work. Isn't it the class conscious proposition that we are looking for? Isn't it a working class proposition? That is what we have here and that is what we want to vote for, not a mixed up confusion.

Delegate Hurst's time was extended for ten minutes.

DEL. HURST: I thank you for the extension of time.

Now, this is absolutely an uncompromising proposition. It stands for no compromise. There is no resisting its onward trend. There is no sidetracking it. It is the one direction in which to travel and its conditions are laid down clearly.

Some will say you cannot do it while the government is in the hands of the capitalists. The capitalists will not grant it and therefore it is not practical. My answer to that is that we are making a great many demands that are not practical. But it is practical. It is practical to attract men and educate them upon what we want. When a man out of work finds that there is a party that knows how to acquire those things and is willing to offer a remedy if given an opportunity, then he will turn against the parties who have that power and refuse to use it. He will not starve when he knows how starvation can be avoided. It is because he has believed it impossible that he has been so patient and there is no reason why we should ignore these methods when we know that they are scientific, saying to these men, "Give us the power and then we will do what we promised to do." It is an honest proposition to offer a man. He wants to know how to do it. Your United States government does create money and does loan it to the national bankers at one-half of one per cent. On the first of May, 1908, the national banker was using six hundred and ninety-seven million dollars of that kind of

money. We are loaning it to the banker at one-half of one per cent. When the people of Chicago want to put up a three million dollar building they go to the banker and borrow the money back and pay five per cent for thirty years' loan. We put up the three million dollar building; we do all the work from foundation to roof, the workers create every particle of it—we create the money, we loan it to him at one-half of one per cent and then borrow it back at five per cent on bonds running thirty years, which makes four and a half millions in interest. We pay the banker for allowing us to use our own money. We have just as much right to pay that money to laborers for work as we have to borrow it and pay it to the bankers. You never had anything in the platform that will develop half the interest that this plank will, nor one that will scare the capitalist more. He knows that if this matter is discussed the whole scheme will be exposed. There is no reason why we should ignore this opportunity. It will expose those things and at the same time will lead right on toward the goal that we are striving for. When you put men to work and sell the proceeds at cost of production and distribution and you employ every man in that way eventually, where will the capitalist come in? Aren't they going to disappear when they come into competition with such a method as that? As they fall out of the capitalist industries they will fall into this and we will put them to work and without creating any confusion and without bringing about a cataclysm, something which everyone but an impossibilist knows will never happen. The change will come about by evolution. It is a great opportunity if we only know enough to grasp it.

DEL. POPE (Mo.): On the 19th of October, 1907, the bankers of New York decided that they would do something that the bankers of the world had never done before. They met and said: "The industrial condition of this country is so bad that we cannot save the banking business and the industrial business at the same time, so as we want to escape a deluge we will take a freshet," and they issued certain documents, and little prosperity took the dose and she has been in a comatose state ever since.

I want to say that this substitute is worth more than that whole platform, and every other immediate demand that you have put up here. I want to say

that this is the key to the situation. This is the central point of attack, because this resolution put before the people is an open challenge to the Republican and Democratic parties to relieve the situation if they can. In 1893 the Republican party said that the Democratic party brought on the panic, and the fool Democrats didn't have sense enough to deny it. They said, "Well, we were caught with the goods, what was the use of denying it." Now, nine-tenths of the Republican party did not believe that a panic could come when the Republican party was in power, but on the 19th of last October the panic had commenced, and now there are five million Republicans in this country who don't know where they are at and they are waiting to see which way to go. Now, this resolution means something. It means if put in force that the panic would be broken. I believe it is the duty of every Socialist in the United States to ask every Democratic and Republican speaker when he is on the stump what is the cause of the panic and what is the remedy, and get his answer; and when you do, if he doesn't talk Socialism the people will know it and Socialism will get a hearing that it never had before.

I hope that this resolution will be adopted unanimously, and we will challenge the Democratic and Republican parties to battle, and when we win, as we shall, it will be a sweeping victory for the working class.

DEL. WOODBY (Cal.): I want to find out from the last speaker where the constitution gives the right to take private property?

DEL. FIELDMAN (N. Y.): What does the right of eminent domain mean?

DEL. WOODBY: The right to take property with proper compensation. I have not got the information I asked for yet.

A DELEGATE: Did Comrade Hurst say that if we passed this resolution the panic would be broken? (Laughter.)

DEL. HILLQUIT: I am very much afraid that if we adopt the substitute we shall do exactly the opposite of what we think we are doing.

There is not a man on this floor who is more in favor of practical immediate demands than I am. But those demands must be practical and the test of practicability is: is it enforceable? If we should get out a good, strong demand for the relief of unemployment and put

it up to the present government, and the present government ignores it, we are put in a position of favoring something for the welfare of the working class which the government rejects. If we put ourselves on record as demanding something impossible under present conditions we are on record as hot air theorists. I say make not only an immediate demand, but an urgency demand, a demand to be enforced tomorrow, a demand to be enforced to relieve the present existing crisis. It must be made in such a form that the government, if it had the desire, could actually enforce it. If it cannot be, we have not even made a propaganda, or done anything useful, but have made ourselves a laughing stock for the nation.

Now, consider. Assume that we are in Congress. I am a representative, say of New York, representing the Socialist Party in Congress, and I move that the government shall employ every willing worker, affirming as a general principle he has the right to exist and the right to work, and demanding that as an urgency measure. I then proceed to state in what way it is to be done. I am compelled to show how to get the money. I say: "You have the power to stamp pieces of paper and call them dollars; therefore go ahead, make your dollars, and the unemployed working men will get the paper as wages."

A DELEGATE: Isn't that as good as any other money?

DEL. HILLQUIT: Oh, no.

A DELEGATE: Back of it stands the industry of the country.

DEL. HILLQUIT: Then you will go back to the greenback days.

A DELEGATE: Even if you do, what then?

DEL. HILLQUIT: I say that when you go before the working men of this country and say "Go to work for the government; the government will employ you all; and you will get paper which the government will call money," with nothing to back it with, I say in that case we make ourselves ridiculous before the working men of America.

It is proposed that the government by right of eminent domain shall take over property as the same may be necessary for the employment of the workers. That means to take over practically all of the industries in the United States.

A DELEGATE: Do you object to that?

DEL. HILLQUIT: No. But if I ask them to do that immediately, if I put that in as part of the Socialist platform, and go to the working men and say: "You are out of work, and there is an easy and practical method of giving you employment, to-wit: let the nation assume all the industries, print money and give all the working men work"—I say we should simply make ourselves ridiculous.

DEL. ANDERSON (N. D.): A point of information. I want to know from Comrade Hillquit if it is not the fact that the demand notes issued at the time of Abraham Lincoln were not full legal tender regardless of any gold back of them?

DEL. HILLQUIT: They were not at the time. They were just as good as paper currency, except it so happened that the United States subsequently made them good in the regular way.

DEL. ANDERSON: They were full legal tender and circulated at par.

DEL. BAUER (Cal.): A point of information. The resolution says that the goods shall be sold to the consumers at cost of production and distribution. I would like to ask would the men employed by the government come in competition with those employed by the capitalists?

A DELEGATE: They would.

DEL. BAUER: I think I can say all I want to say in three minutes. We know the secretary of the treasury loans money to Wall Street. We have the right to demand the same thing. Of course we have, but there is just one thing that we haven't got. We have the right, but we haven't got the might. We haven't the organized power to get what is our right. Let us recognize that it is just as easy to stand out for the whole Socialist proposition as it is to put through such immediate demands as that. What is the use of talking? Are we going back to the old greenback movement and thrash out the old money question again? I thought we had learned something in the last forty years. Apparently we have not. I think, however, that we are taking ourselves too seriously. I know that we are all statesmen and scholars and philosophers. I myself have a stack of resolutions that high and I know they are better than any that are presented here, but I do not intend to present them tonight because it is getting late, but pre-

pare yourselves for the worst in the morning. I hold, however, in the course of evolution this party will arrive at the point where it is a working class party. I know that the tadpole in its evolution toward the frog gradually loses its tail and I hope that the Socialist movement when it finally becomes a true working class movement, will also lose its tail, these immediate demands. I thought we had sense enough now to chop off that tail. You may think you are making history with your immediate demands. Don't flatter yourselves. The Democratic and Republican parties will go you one better on every immediate demand. The reform movements will go you one better and there will come a time when you will have to occupy the only position which you are entitled to and that is the clear fighting position of the revolutionary Socialist who knows that he can get nothing except under

Socialism. Let it be whole hog or none. We will hew to the line. I move to lay this amendment on the table. I move to table the substitute.

THE CHAIRMAN: A motion has been made and seconded that the substitute be tabled.

Cries of "Division."

THE CHAIRMAN: Those in favor of tabling the substitute will raise their hands and keep them raised until counted.

The vote stands in favor of tabling the substitute 63; opposed, 45. The substitute is tabled. The question is now upon the adoption of the resolution offered by the committee. Those in favor of the adoption of the committee's report will say aye. Those opposed, no. The report of the committee is adopted.

The convention then adjourned until May 16th, 1908, at 10 A. M.

SEVENTH DAY'S SESSION

The convention was called to order at 10 a. m. by Secretary Heath.

Del. Bower of Illinois was appointed assistant secretary in place of Del. Strickland, who had to go home.

Del. Wheat of California was elected chairman for the day.

THE CHAIRMAN: In view of the experience of the past few days, a very brief sentence or two of prefatory remarks will be in order. I desire to say that in recognizing comrades who desire to speak, I shall use my judgment. I desire to say further that the amount of noise made by any delegate desiring the floor will have no influence upon the chair in getting recognition. I further desire to say that any comrade who after a decision of the chair has been rendered, persists in shouting at the chair or at the convention in defiance of the chair, will stand very little chance of catching the chairman's eye at any subsequent period during the day. The business before the convention this morning is upon the report of the Committee on Platform as a whole.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PLATFORM RESUMED.

DEL. OSBORNE (Cal.): I want to say this before I introduce the substitute for the immediate demands. I asked the chairman yesterday if this substitute would be in order at the conclusion of the discussion. I should have preferred to introduce the substitute at the time of that discussion and it would have saved, if adopted, all the discussion of yesterday afternoon and last night. I want the secretary to read it and then I desire to speak upon it.

ASST. SEC. REILLY (Reading): "The Socialist party when in office shall always and everywhere, until the present system is abolished, make the answer to this question its guiding rule of con-

duct, namely, will this legislation advance the interests of the working class and aid the workers in their struggle against capitalism? If it is in the interest of the working class the Socialist party is in favor of it. If it is against the interest of the working class the Socialist party is opposed to it."

The motion was duly seconded.

DEL. OSBORNE: I think we are all opportunists when it comes to that, the only difference being that some of us are working class opportunists and some of us are middle class opportunists or capitalist class opportunists. I consider the entire program is an ultra middle class or capitalist class pronouncement. I recognize that there are two elements in this convention and naturally will be in all conventions. We do not all expect to see a proposition from the same standpoint, and the whole question, to my mind, is this; I should have liked to bring this up yesterday and decide which side of this question the convention stands, which would have saved time. I draw in my own mind the distinction between the part that the business man and the populist take in social evolution and the work of the working class in social evolution. I don't want to have to do any of the work that belongs to the capitalist class. They are doing that business well enough. Marx tells us that no social order can disappear until it has developed all the productive forces for which there is room within it, and that no society can appear until the material conditions for its existence have been created or are in process of creation out of the old society. I maintain that it is the business of the capitalist class to develop all the productive forces for which there is room in this society, and it is also the business of the capitalist class to prepare the material conditions for the disappearance

be in ninety years. There are a great number of states that require one year's residence, a number that require two years and a few that require six months' residence. I do not deem it necessary to make an extended speech on this question, because I believe that you are inclined to favor it and, therefore, I will not bother you any longer.

DEL. REILLY: I suggest that there be some age limit. You must remember that a person born in the United States is a citizen from the time of his birth.

A DELEGATE: I shall vote against that because of this fact. I do not believe that the Socialist party should take any position stating what length of time any member of the working class should have to live in any part of the United States before they can vote. The trade unions require no residence before they allow the members to vote. I think all citizens should be allowed to cast a vote wherever they happen to be on election day regardless of ninety days or any other time of residence. I don't think the Socialist party should go on record as fixing any time that a citizen should live in one place before he can vote.

DEL. PORTER (Neb.): I should like to add the word "territory" after the word "state."

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection that will stand.

A DELEGATE: In our town whenever a corporation wants a franchise and the citizens are opposed to it, our corporations send over to Kentucky, just across the river, and they bring in negroes by car loads and ship loads and board them there thirty days and in that way most valuable franchises are grabbed by these corporations. In our state we have thirty days. If you make it five days you simply make it easier for the franchise grabbers to get everything they want. Therefore I oppose this.

DEL. FURMAN (N. Y.): A point of order. The matter of franchise is a matter for state legislation entirely. It is for the state convention to take action on this, not for the national convention, because each state makes its own laws regardless of the franchise laws in neighboring states.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point is not well taken.

DEL. FRAENCKEL (Ill.): The comrade in front of me has raised a point which we in the large cities can

substantiate. There should be no resolution adopted by this convention or anything in the platform of this organization that disfranchises any part of the working class. It is part of the capitalist system in these days to prevent the working class from voting. They are preventing women from getting the vote. They have to some extent prevented the working class from voting on election day. In Chicago and all large cities you will find that registration day is only an identification. If you set a time limit or if you were to make any kind of a limit there you work into the hands of those who want to prevent the working men from voting. If this resolution goes through you simply add another club to the weapons in the hands of those who are anxious to deprive us of the franchise, to slug us on election day or throw out our vote.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): I move the previous question.

The motion was seconded and carried.

DEL. RAMP (Ore.): I have listened to the speech of the comrade from Illinois against the amendment, and I would suggest to the Illinois delegation that they apply that argument to the whole immediate demand program. To those comrades who tell us that the capitalist class are going to take voters from one city to another, we reply that they are doing it and they have done it and they will do it. I tell you that they are exporting voters from one state. Two years ago in the town of Bisbee, Ariz., six weeks before election, six hundred of the workmen who were Socialists were driven out so they could not vote. They were disfranchised. Governor Waite, when he ran for the second term, was defeated by the same method. We have got to counteract these things that the capitalist class do to disfranchise our voters. I recognize that the comrades in eastern states have no conception of the difficulties that the western states suffer from in this direction. In the West you are liable to meet a man in Montana in April, in Arizona in May, Colorado in June and California in August. There is continual moving about, and with these requirements of one and two years' residence they are disfranchised all the time, and as a Socialist, an impossibilist Socialist if you wish, I want to oppose that sort of thing. If the gentleman down here who made the

damnable speech a few moments ago—it is the man who makes the most obnoxious speeches who put in bills for sleeping car accommodations, while the real Socialists are compelled to sleep in their seats. It is the men who sleep in water tanks and under hay stacks that I represent, and those men I am going to represent as long as I stand on the floor of any convention, and you are not going to frighten me into any submission to the intellectuals. It is good discipline that we are having rubbed into us here. I am not going to tell you that you are either too young or too ignorant, I am not going to call you any names, but I am satisfied to discuss this question fairly and honestly. But if you drive me to it I can call names as hard as you can.

A DELEGATE: A point of order. The gentleman is not talking about the question.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair rules that the point is not well taken.

DEL. RAMP: You know that I am opposed to immediate demands, but if we are to put in any immediate demands, for heaven's sake don't turn down the Western States on this proposition, which is a trade union proposition.

DEL. KORNGOLD (Ill.): A point of personal privilege. I want to say that the gentleman misunderstood Del. Morgan entirely.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is not a matter of personal privilege. Comrade Morgan, like everybody else, is liable to be misunderstood.

DEL. BROWN (Wash.): I had hoped that it would not require any discussion to get this question before you. Away back in '96 I heard a man of no less eminence than General Howard, with one arm lost in the Civil war, standing before an audience make this declaration. He said: "If I had to make the laws regulating the franchise I would make a property qualification necessary for any man before he could exercise the right of suffrage; and with him on that stage on that occasion was Russell A. Alger, of Michigan, and other notable men. That burned its way into my being. I know something about the fellow you call a proletarian, and, my friends, I have slept both in a Pullman and under a water tank. Now, there is a meaning in the resolution. What we want is to poll all our votes, and are you going to refuse and reject this method of getting

it? You gentlemen tell us that the corporations import voters. Well, the corporations if they go on organizing industries to a point where you will have to industrialize them by your political action, why let them go on. Let us have it, but don't let us have a restricted franchise. Many Socialists of our country are disfranchised, and I believe it is proper for us to protest against the further disfranchisement of our fellow citizens. It is important that we declare ourselves on this point. It has been said that this is a national question. Certainly it is a national question, and this is a national convention, and the national convention should speak out. I think this resolution should pass. If it were in order I should like to make a further amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: That would not be in order.

DEL. BROWN: Then I will simply say as one of my boys said when he got in a scrap with his older brother, "It is not what you want that makes you fat; it is what you get." It is what we get that will make us fat, so let us get what we can.

DEL. HILLQUIT (N. Y.): I am opposed to the amendment for several reasons. In the first place, it has no business in a national platform, because it is a state matter. In the next place, it should not be passed, because it would affect different states differently. It would be a progressive measure in some states and a retrogressive measure in other states. It might be a good thing in one state and a dangerous thing in another, especially in the crowded industrial districts. I am opposed to it because we should not burden our program with too many minute detailed demands. There are over two hundred delegates here and each one has a certain pet measure, and if we all offer them and they are adopted you will have an unwieldy instrument. Furthermore, let me remind you that we have still four committees outstanding that we have spent a very large amount of time in deliberation on the platform, and I believe a true sense of proportion should dictate the wisdom of dispensing with much discussion where it is not really demanded. If we don't the danger is that important matters coming later will be passed without any deliberation.

A DELEGATE: I wish to speak against the amendment. It does not go

far enough. You establish a legal residence for traveling men of all kinds in order that they may vote in election. The capitalists provide for those; why should we not provide for our comrades? I think we should put in another clause and secure the vote for all our comrades.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question recurs on the motion of Del. Brown, of Washington. Those in favor of that resolution will say aye. Those opposed no. The motion is lost.

DEL. GOAZIOU (Pa.): I move that the original report that has been adopted section by section, be now tabled. (The motion to table was seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded that the report of the Platform Committee in regard to immediate demands be laid on the table.

DEL. THOMPSON (Wis.): A point of order. The convention has already adopted those various sections.

A DELEGATE: Does this include the entire demands, the industrial demands and the political demands?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, the whole thing.

A DELEGATE: Would a motion to substitute be in order?

THE CHAIRMAN: It is not in order.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion before the house is that the program be laid on the table. Those in favor say aye. Those opposed no. The motion is lost.

DEL. STREBEL (N. Y.): I desire to offer a resolution to be embodied in the immediate demands.

THE CHAIRMAN: In order to do that you will have to move to reconsider.

DEL. STREBEL: I will simply submit it to your judgment and hope that a vote will be taken on it. I don't think that anything I can say in five minutes will change the preconceived ideas of any delegate. The resolution is as follows: "The abolition of the power of the Supreme Court of the United States to pass upon legislation enacted by Congress as to its constitutionality. Legislation passed by Congress to be repealed or abrogated only by act of Congress or referendum vote of the whole people."

I move the adoption of this demand.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor of that motion will say aye. Opposed no. The motion is carried unanimously.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): I don't know whether I am in order or not. My purpose is this: I want to put before the rank and file of the party the preamble, platform and program, and at the same time, the platform that we had in the last national campaign, the two to go together to the membership for a vote. I make that now as a motion, that the preamble, platform and program submitted by the committee as amended, and the platform of the last national campaign, shall be submitted to the membership for a referendum vote.

DEL. SIMONS (Ill.) A point of order. The delegate cannot move to do that as we have already taken action upon the platform and it would be necessary to reconsider the vote of yesterday.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point is well taken.

DEL. SIMONS: I wish to move now the adoption of the entire report as amended.

The motion was duly seconded.

DEL. MORGAN: I move the previous question.

The motion was duly seconded and carried.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): I am opposed to this motion because I want this carried out in a different way. For twelve hours we have debated this matter of whether we are opportunists or impossibilists and whether we want or do not want immediate demands. I say that the rank and file should have an opportunity to vote on this matter. I say that most of the delegates in this convention are opposed really to this platform as it is adopted. They have taken something they do not want, to get something they do want. We have three thousand words, we have a preamble and platform that practically duplicate themselves. Then when they come to the bedrock statement of principles it is very ineffectively put together. This committee has done its work faithfully. I don't want to cast any reflection upon them, but I think that we should take the report and submit it with the platform of the last campaign and let the rank and file decide which of these two is the most practical exposition of the Socialist philosophy.

DEL. JOHNS (Cal.): I am opposed to the adoption of this populist hash, unless something like this is placed at the head of it, and I hope the motion

will be voted down so that we may have a chance to consider its points. We have been told that the impossibilists, as we are called, are opposed to men having more wages now, or any benefits along the lines of these immediate demands until the Socialist party elects its candidates. Nothing could be more untrue, nothing could be more absurd than the position that these opponents of ours take. All of us who are called impossibilists are in favor of immediate benefits to the working class, but we are not in favor of bamboozling the workingmen to get them. Now, I would like to place before the immediate demands this proposition: "We call the attention of the workers of America to the fact that government ownership of public utilities, old age pensions for worn-out wage-slaves, and all other steps with reference to alleged benefits to the working class, can best be gained by rolling up a healthy Socialist vote, as has been done in the countries of Europe." We need not make any formal demand in our platform for any degree of state Socialism of doubtful benefit to the working class, because all that we ask and more will be granted by our masters when our vote on election day shall become great enough to be regarded as a menace. Then many things will be given to the workers by the Republican and Democratic parties. All you want here you will get if you roll up a great Socialist vote and elect a few Socialists on your ticket.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): Socialism is a phase of civilization, just as capitalism is a phase of civilization, just as feudalism was a phase of civilization. You will never be able to say "We will get together tomorrow afternoon at 2 o'clock and introduce the co-operative commonwealth." No one can tell the exact day or the exact year when capitalism commenced as an epoch of the world's civilization. No one can tell me the exact day or year when feudalism ceased—we find a great deal of feudalism in Europe even now. And no one will ever be able to tell the day or year or even the decade when Socialism will begin to rule the world. Conditions are changing constantly. We are constantly working toward Socialism. It is continuous steady work. Next year, or ten years, or twenty years, or a hundred years, from now, we shall perhaps still be working toward the completing of

our civilization—toward Socialism. The position of the impossibilist is a very easy one. All he has to do is to learn a few holy words and then stand on the street corner and shout. It is the cheapest thing in the world. Our impossibilists are practically anarchists who are too cowardly to admit it. I have heard this shouting of blessed words before. Talk about proletarians and factory workers—if you look over the delegates here you will find that most of the impossibilists came from states where they see the factory worker when he comes down the pike as a hobo. You will find that impossibilists come from states where factories are less frequent than moonshine distilleries. They come from states where Socialists are rare birds and where our party polls no vote.

A VOICE: How about California?

DEL. BERGER: In California you impossibilists have ruined our movement. Take the states of Illinois, New York, Wisconsin—they are solid against impossibilism. This platform is not an ideal platform, of course. Where there is a committee made up of men of varying views the report will always be more or less patched. This platform does not satisfy me exactly, neither did the platform four years ago. We did the best we could. But we did something. But did you ever see an impossibilist do something? Except talking and calling those who do something bad names? To cut out the immediate demands would mean suicide for the party. It would make this party an impossibilist party, and an impossible party. So much for the freaks among the impossibilists.

However, some of our impossibilist friends are well meaning and honest. But they are simply old populists who became sore at the "immediate demands" because the Democrats stole their party with the 16 to 1 platform, and they have been sore ever since. (Applause.) The Democrats stole the Populist platform easily enough, but it was not that steal that ruined populism. The economic conditions got to be such that the farmer received a dollar per bushel for wheat, in gold and not in silver. That killed the populist party, which was a farmers' party. It was not the stealing of their thunder by Bryan. However, ever since there are a lot of those populists around looking for a party. Some of them have cut off their beards, learned a few So-

cialistic phrases and now they are impossible Socialists.

Comrades, this party for a long time must be a proletarian city party, made up largely of the city element. The proletarian factory elements must dominate it and are going to dominate it, although we want the friendship and co-operation of the farmers. I hope the farmers will very soon have a political class organization of their own and then those of our ex-populist friends who don't like our city party can go there and let their impossible beards grow again. We must have a working program for our party and we are going to have it.

DEL. SIMONS: I want to make a little explanation on behalf of the committee. In the first place, I think the thing is not fully understood. There are three parts to this platform. It is not the most perfect platform that every single person on the Platform Committee would have liked to see. It had to be hurried through within two days, or we would have taken longer, so that we had the alternative of turning it in here as you have it there or throwing it on the floor.

There are three parts, as you notice. The first is called the preamble, although I have very little use for the name. I think there ought to be one declaration of principles. The preamble is offered to you as a sort of permanent statement, a thing that can be kept standing in those Socialist papers that wish to keep some regular statement of Socialism in their columns all the time, whether followed or not by the immediate demands. I believe Berger will consent that the comrades of Washington and Oklahoma shall print that portion at the head of their paper and not say anything about the other if they do not feel like it, although they may want to talk about it. But as a matter of fact, this is a declaration of principles. Personally I believe the other parts are of equal or more importance.

The second portion is intended as what is ordinarily called a platform, an indictment of present conditions.

And having explained Socialism, and having indicted present conditions, it is then for us to say what we propose to fight for, what we want, and there we say to our comrades that in Chicago and New York and Milwaukee and St. Louis, wherever there is a great city, we are fighting not on the soap box alone.

There is no single day in the last year and a half that there has not been a bitter fight on of some kind in the city of Chicago, on which the Socialist party had to take some party action, on the soap box, in the paper, and wherever it had any chance or place to fight. We were in the fight, we were in the class struggle, and not talking about the class struggle. (Applause.) And because of that fact, because of the fact that we have got fights here all the time, because this battle is on here, we want you to adopt this report of the Platform Committee as a whole, with its declaration of principles, its indictment of present society, and its program of the things that we are going to fight for.

Now, it is said against this that we ought simply to say that when we elect people in the legislatures or anywhere we should make the question of the attitude and the effect of any measure on the working class their standard of action. I prefer that this convention shall decide what is in the interest of the working class rather than that a committee shall. (Applause.) I believe in democratic rule. I believe in the rule of the rank and file, and I think we are to have a larger representation of the rank and file here in this city or state, that we shall have some men elected to the legislature or the municipality, and it is for us to say here what is to the interest of the working class and what is not to the interest of the working class. (Applause.) We want to show what the class struggle is, so that when our speakers go to the people we may be sure that they know what that means. Let us see that they know what they are talking about, and that they fill the people with something besides hot air. (Applause.) And, therefore, I want to ask you, comrades, that when this comes to a vote you vote to adopt the report of the committee, and then refer it to a committee to smooth out the language, and you will have had both reports before you, and when it is published you can see it, so that the committee cannot do any juggling with it. So I ask you to adopt the report.

THE CHAIRMAN: The previous question is now to be put.

DEL. WILLIAMS (Minn.): I move that the vote be called by roll-call. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is any useful purpose to be served by the roll-

call, of course the convention can have it if it wants it. It consumes almost twenty minutes to take the roll-call.

DEL. SIMONS: I rise to a point of order. It takes a majority to call for the roll-call. We are all on record on this.

THE CHAIRMAN: As many as are in favor of the motion to adopt will say aye. Opposed by the same sign. The motion is carried.

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): I move that the rules covering the discussion after the previous question is moved be changed.

THE CHAIRMAN: You desire a reconsideration?

DEL. MORGAN: Yes, so that no one can be heard except the chairman of the committee whose report is under consideration. If I get a second I will tell the reason why.

The motion to reconsider was seconded and carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that after the previous question has been ordered it be the rule of this convention that no one but the person offering the resolution or the chairman of the committee offering it shall have the privilege of speaking.

The motion was carried.

Del. Maynard moved that the report of the Woman's Committee be the first order of business after adjournment. (Seconded.)

Del. Solomon moved to amend that the report of the Committee on Constitution be the first order of business, on the ground of its greater importance. The motion was seconded and carried as amended.

INTERNATIONAL SECRETARY.

DEL. LEE (N. Y.): A point of order. On Monday, I believe, the convention voted that it would elect the Secretary to the International Socialist Bureau. That was, I believe, regularly on the order of business about two days ago, but was, as the chairman for that day informed me, inadvertently missed. My point of order is that the election of the Delegate or Secretary to the International Socialist Bureau should be taken up.

THE CHAIRMAN: It may be taken up right now, if you like. It lacks ten minutes of adjourning time yet, and we can dispose of it in ten minutes.

DEL. LEE: We are to elect a Secretary to the International Socialist Bureau; that is to say, a representative of the Socialist party of America in what we may call the central committee of the Socialist party of the world. We have a secretary representative in that body already in the person of Morris Hillquit, who has served there since the last convention. I nominate Comrade Morris Hillquit for that position here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further nominations?

It was moved and seconded to close the nominations.

There being no further nominations, the chair declared the nominations closed, and Del. Hillquit was then unanimously elected.

COMMITTEE ON EDITING PLATFORM.

It was moved and carried to elect a committee on the literary features of the platform.

Lee, Simons and Berger were elected. The convention then, at 12:40, adjourned until 2 p. m.

AFTERNOON SESSION

Chairman Wheat called the convention to order at 2 o'clock.

CANADIAN FRATERNAL DELEGATES.

DEL. WORK (Iowa): I wish to move that the first order of business tomorrow morning be to hear from the fraternal delegates from the Dominion of Canada.

The motion was seconded and carried.

Del. Branstetter called attention to the omission of the name of Del. Wills of Oklahoma from the ballot for the election of a Committee on Farmers' Program, and the delegates were requested to make pencil corrections accordingly.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTION.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Committee on Constitution has the floor. Will the delegates listen to the Committee on Constitution?

Del. Gaylord, of Wisconsin, chairman of the Committee on Constitution, then made the following report on behalf of that committee:

DEL. GAYLORD: I think the committee may be permitted a word by way of preface. We realize that some of these matters may not be agreed upon. The majority of the committee have agreed upon some things, which, frankly, we do not expect the convention to accept at this time, according to reports that have reached us; but we have used our best information and our best thought, and what we recommend is, we believe, in line with an efficient organization. If you decide otherwise, it is for you to do so.

Section 1, article I, is the same as the original draft.

Article I.

Section 1. The name of this organization shall be the Socialist Party, except in states where a different name has become or may become a legal requirement.

It was moved and seconded that the article be adopted. Carried.

Article II, section 1, was read as follows:

Article II.

Section 1. Every person, resident of the United States, of the age of eighteen and upward, without distinction of sex, race, color or creed, who has severed his connection with all other political parties and subscribes to the principles of the Socialist Party, shall be eligible to membership in the party.

DEL. STARKWEATHER (Cal.): Instead of the two words "distinction of" I wish to insert the three words "discrimination as to." It will then read, "Every person, resident of the United States, of the age of eighteen years and upward, without discrimination as to sex, race, color or creed."

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you make a motion?

DEL. STARKWEATHER: I make a motion that this change be made.

The amendment was seconded and carried.

DEL. CANNON (Ariz.): I wish to offer another amendment to the same paragraph. I offer this amendment on account of something that came up in our local a few weeks ago. I move to amend by inserting so as to make it read as follows: "without distinction," or as amended by the comrade, "of sex, race, color or creed, who is not on the unfair list of organized labor." (Amendment not seconded.) Now, in a few words I will explain my position. For nine months last year we had a strike in Bisbee, not for the closed shop, but for the open shop.

THE CHAIRMAN: Excuse me a moment. Do I hear a second to the motion?

The amendment was seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: Proceed.

DEL. CANNON: We had a strike not with the closed shop, but with the open shop.

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): A point of order. The amendment would let in several democrats and republicans.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, that is not a point of order.

DEL. MORGAN: Yes, it is.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is an argument on the question.

DEL. CANNON: After the strike

—that strike was to give us the privilege of working if we had the little red card of the Socialist Party in our pocket, and if we had the union card in our pocket that was all right. We struck. When the strike was over those people who had been unfair from beginning to end and wanted to go out to the world with a clear reputation made application in the Socialist local, and I am sorry to say that at a packed meeting on one occasion one of them was admitted into membership in the Socialist Party, although it was done by unfair means, and that man is free to go anywhere in the United States. You all know that the little red card of the Socialist party is an evidence of membership, of comradeship, a respectable document to show anywhere, and I just want to keep it that way.

DEL. MORGAN: I move to lay the amendment on the table. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Those in favor of laying the amendment on the table will say aye. Opposed, no. The chair is in doubt as to the result of the vote. Those in favor of laying the amendment on the table will raise their hands.

DEL. O. F. BRANSTETTER (Okla.): Does the chair rule that when the amendment is laid on the table that carries the section with it?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, the amendment is that after the word "creed" there be introduced "and who is not unfair from the labor union point of view."

DEL. STRICKLAND: I ask for another reading of that.

DEL. CANNON: "Who is not on the unfair list of organized labor."

THE CHAIRMAN: "Who is not on the unfair list of organized labor." As many as are in favor of laying the amendment on the table will raise the right hand and hold it up until counted. Those who are opposed to laying it on the table will raise their hands. There is no need of counting. The motion is carried and the amendment is laid on the table.

DEL. WILKE (Ga.): I move that we insert the words "or her" after the word "his." In other words, if we adopt it, it will read "without distinction of sex, race, color or creed,

who has severed his or her connection with all other political parties."

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there a second? No second.

It was moved to lay the amendment on the table.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is no second to the original motion.

DEL. STIRTON (Mich.): A point of information, if the chair can decide or if there is some grammarian present who can decide this for me. In connections such as this I think that ordinarily masculine nouns are used, but they are common nouns in gender. Is that correct?

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair will state that ordinarily it is understood in what is called the generic sense.

DEL. STIRTON: That is what I wanted to state.

THE CHAIRMAN: They include both sexes. That is ordinarily understood. However, that is a matter for this convention to decide.

DEL. HOGAN (Ark.): I desire to offer an amendment to section 1 of Article II, striking out the following words: "of the age of eighteen years and upward." (Seconded.) In support of that amendment, comrades and fellow delegates, I desire to say that I am acquainted with a number of cases of young men and young ladies who are bright and earnest students of the Socialist philosophy and who desire to affiliate with the party and bear their just proportion of the expense of the maintenance of the organization, and who ought to be permitted to join, but owing to this provision in our national constitution they are unable to do so. In the interest of the organization and for this purpose I offer this amendment, and I hope it will carry without any discussion.

DEL. GERBER (N. Y.): Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the delegate over there. I think if we do anything at all we ought to extend the age limit and not cut it down. Now, this is a political party to a very large extent, and there is hardly a state in the Union in which a man can vote before he is at least twenty-one years of age, and by this amendment you are going to make our party composed of little boys and girls, sixteen,

fifteen, fourteen and thirteen years old. If we can get the young people interested in the Socialist movement let the comrades organize them in Sunday schools or otherwise and bring them up to become Socialists, and when they get to the age of eighteen they will understand the philosophy of Socialism and they will be a help to us, and not have little boys and girls in the party organization. (Applause.) Mr. Chairman and fellow delegates, this is no child-play affair. This is not an admiration society. We go in to do certain work, and this party is organized to do certain work, and we want to have grown people to do the work. We don't care to have children in the party, but when they grow up they will be ready to become members of the party.

DEL. McDEVITT (Cal.): I move to lay the amendment on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was carried.

DEL. KRAFFT (N. J.): I move that the word "twenty-one" be substituted for "eighteen." (Seconded.) I give you to understand that our members participate in the primaries, and if we make nominations of boys of eighteen our nominations will be contested. We must have men twenty-one years of age.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): I move that that be tabled. We are tired of this child's play. We don't want a kindergarten.

The amendment was laid on the table.

DEL. SNYDER (Kan.): I wish to ask the committeemen why they did not bring these objections up while they were in the committee, instead of delaying matters now. This man was on the committee.

DEL. ANDERSON (Minn.): I move to adopt the report as amended. The motion was seconded and Section 1 of Article II was adopted as amended.

The next section was read as follows:

Section 2. Any person occupying a position, honorary or remunerative, by gift of any other political party (civil service positions excepted) shall not be eligible to membership in the Socialist Party.

It was moved and seconded that the section be adopted.

DEL. ROSS (Okla.): A point of information from that committee. One time in my state, Oklahoma, I found a man who was holding a commission as a notary public, and when we brought the attention of the State Committee to that fact there was a question raised. I want to say to you that he is a good Socialist and has been the secretary of the local ever since he has been a member of the party, and that is more than two years.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are desiring information as to whether the position of notary public is a political position?

DEL. ROSS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will hear from the chairman of the committee.

DEL. ROSS: Mr. Chairman, my party—

THE CHAIRMAN: No, let us get the information. Never mind what your party did.

DEL. ROSS: No, but here is what I want to say. It was brought to the State Committee; I brought it up as a state committeeman. One of the committee replied that the National Executive Committee ruled that it was not a political gift.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us hear what the opinion of the chairman of the committee is.

DEL. GAYLORD: In the opinion of the committee such an office—well, I cannot speak for the committee, since the matter did not come up in any of our sessions, but if you ask me I would say that generally the office of notary public is not considered a political office.

DEL. ROSS: That is what I wanted to know.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to this section?

DEL. O. F. BRANSTETTER (Okla.): I move to amend by substituting the words, "elective or appointive," before the word "position."

DEL. GAYLORD: A notary public is appointed.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is no second.

DEL. ANDERSON (Minn.): I move to amend in the third line of Section 2, after the word "any," by

inserting the words "party other than the Socialist Party." In some states we put up tickets that don't declare for Socialism, and we are not clear whether that is against our laws or not. I move to adopt the amendment. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Let the chair state it as the chair understands it.

DEL. ANDERSON: I will read it if you wish.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very well, read it as it should be.

DEL. ANDERSON: "Section 2. Any person occupying a position, honorary or remunerative, by gift of any party other than the Socialist Party (civil service positions excepted), shall not be eligible to membership in the Socialist Party."

The amendment was carried, and the section as amended was adopted.

The next section was read:

Section 3. A member who desires to transfer his membership from a local in one state to a local in another state may do so upon the presentation of his card showing him to be in good standing at the time of asking for such transfer.

DEL. McDEVITT (Cal.): That should be "from the party in one state to the party in another state." There are members at large in several states.

DEL. GAYLORD: Where do you insert, and what do you insert?

DEL. McDEVITT: "A member who desires to transfer his membership from the party in one state to the party in another state."

A DELEGATE: That will not make any provision for transferring from one local to another local in the same state.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is a matter for the state constitution. As many as favor this say aye. Opposed. The motion seems to be carried. It is so ordered.

DEL. HAZLETT (Mont.): I would like to amend by inserting—I think the application card of the party should have a phrase which states that each one who signs that card shall believe in political action, and I would like to speak if I can get a second. I have not stated it very clearly.

THE CHAIRMAN: I wish the delegate would get that in a little more definite order and find the ex-

act place where it ought to go, and then we can go on with something else.

DEL. HAZLETT: I have it in the form of a resolution, but not fixed to go in there as a condition of membership in the party, and that is what I want.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can you get it in words that will be coherent to the convention?

DEL. HAZLETT: If I do that will I have a chance?

THE CHAIRMAN: I will recognize you then, yes.

DEL. GAYLORD: I will say to Comrade Hazlett that that would belong properly in Section 1 of Article II.

DEL. HAZLETT: It will be inserted in Section 1?

DEL. GAYLORD: That is where it should be, if it goes in. Prepare it for the purpose of introducing it.

DEL. HAZLETT: I will.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will give you a chance later on.

The next section was read:

Section 4. No member of the party in any state or territory, shall under any pretext interfere with the regular or organized movement in any other state. Adopted without discussion.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT (Wash.): I wish to add a clause. There is a very conspicuous vacancy in this article, and that vacancy is in regard to the membership pledge. We had an article in the old constitution which read something like this: "All persons wishing to join the Socialist Party must sign the following pledge," and the pledge was inserted in the constitution, and that pledge belongs in the constitution, and I move that this article in the old constitution which deals with that pledge be inserted in this constitution as a separate section. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: You will have it as Section 5 of Article II.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS (Ill.): I rise to a point of order, that that does not state the article in the old constitution.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair rules that as the point is technically sustained, but not—

DEL. SLAYTON: It does not ex-

ist. How can we introduce a certain clause in the old constitution which does not exist?

DEL. WILLIAMS (Minn.): I have a copy of the old constitution, and I cannot find any such passage at all in it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the comrade from Washington desire to renew his motion under another clause?

DEL. WAGENKNECHT: Yes, I make the following as an amendment to a separate clause in this article to read as follows:

Section 5. All persons joining the Socialist Party shall sign the following pledge: I, the undersigned, recognizing the class struggle between the capitalist class and the working class and the necessity of the working class constituting themselves into a political party distinct from and opposed to all parties formed by the propertied class, hereby declare that I have severed my relations with all other parties, that I endorse the platform and constitution of the Socialist Party, and hereby apply for admission to said party. Amendment seconded.

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): There was a section adopted a while ago which provided that those who apply shall give up their membership in any other party.

DEL. REYNOLDS (Ind.): Section 1, Article II, covers that whole amendment which the comrade over there offers, and I move that we lay this on the table.

DEL. GERBER (N. Y.): Does the motion of the delegate from Washington come before the house?

THE CHAIRMAN: It is before the house, and there is a motion to lay it upon the table.

DEL. GERBER: Then I second the motion to lay on the table.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is already seconded. As many as favor it say aye. Opposed, the same. The motion to lay on the table is lost.

DEL. GERBER: I ask for the floor.

THE CHAIRMAN: This comrade (Del. Work) has the floor.

DEL. WORK (Iowa): I move to amend by striking out the expression

"propertied class" and insert the expression "capitalist class." (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the amendment, that the words "propertied class" be stricken out and the words "capitalist class" be inserted.

DEL. HOGAN (Ark.): A point of order. There is a motion before the house.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is a motion to amend the motion before the house. It is proper and in order.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): You provide a certain general provision in this constitution, and then you want to provide how to carry it out, but you don't provide forms. If you want to do so you can in the first clause provide the form of application blank.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you will excuse me, I will ask you to speak simply to the question as to whether you prefer "capitalist class" or "propertied class."

DEL. SLOBODIN: Can't I speak on this question?

THE CHAIRMAN: Not until the main question is settled.

DEL. HAGEL (Okla.): I don't think we ought to have in there "propertied class" or the other word either, because there may be a party formed that does not consist of the propertied class; they may have a union labor party, and we want to vote against them the same as we want to vote against any other party; therefore I oppose that.

Del. A. M. Simons moved the previous question. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: If the comrade will hold it in abeyance for a moment I will put the motion.

DEL. FIELDMAN (N. Y.): Wouldn't it be better to say, "all"—

THE CHAIRMAN: You are out of order. As many as are in favor of the amendment will say aye.

A DELEGATE: Which amendment is that?

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment of Comrade Work, to substitute "capitalist class" for "propertied class."

DEL. POPE (Mo.): A question of information. I think that would have reference to the propertied class and other classes.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, some one suggested that, but the convention took no action.

DEL. GERBER (N. Y.): A point of information. I would like to be informed, if this amendment is defeated or accepted will the main question then be open for debate?

THE CHAIRMAN: Certainly.

DEL. GERBER: All right.

THE CHAIRMAN: As many as are in favor of the amendment say aye. Opposed, no. The amendment is lost.

DEL. GERBER: I rise to speak on the main question. I am opposed to the motion or to the clause offered by the delegate from Washington. I am opposed to it for the following reasons: I do not think it necessary for the constitution to prescribe every little form that will be used in our organization, because all that is necessary in our constitution is to state the qualification for membership of any one who applies for membership, and Section 1, Article II, defines that explicitly. It says, "Every person, resident of the United States, of the age of eighteen years or upward, without distinction of sex, race, color or creed, who has severed his connection with all other political parties, and subscribes to the principles of the Socialist Party, shall be eligible to membership in the party." So that implies that when the application is made we will have the question in it that I state that I have severed my connection with all other political parties, that I do subscribe to the constitution of the Socialist Party, that I do subscribe to the platform of the Socialist party, and therefore am eligible to membership in the Socialist Party. If I cannot do that I am not eligible. Hence it is unnecessary for us to waste time here and waste space in our constitution, because it is a matter of detail for our National Secretary to get the application blank up.

DEL. BOOMER (Wash.): I favor the proposed new article or new section, for the simple reason that the pledge of membership should be uniform in all the states and the national organization should decide what that pledge of membership shall be, and not leave it to each state, perhaps to

have a different clause; but it is simply to have uniformity in the organization that I favor it. We have had it before and it did no harm. Let us continue the same.

DEL. GUY WILLIAMS (Minn.): In answer to the remarks of the last comrade that spoke, it seems to me that it is unnecessary for us to go into all the details of the executive duties of the executive officers of this party. It is left in their charge. The function of this convention is not an executive one, but a legislative one, and I believe we ought to leave to the executive officers the matter of drawing up all the different forms and other things of that kind that are necessarily the function of the executive branch of the organization.

The previous question was moved. Del. Bradford of California took the floor.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS: I rise to a point of order. I moved the previous question and was recognized by the chair and it was accepted, and I have yielded to but one member to speak.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point is well taken.

A DELEGATE: I make a point of order that the question was not put when he offered it.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point is well taken and the chair will decide that we are to vote now as to whether the previous question shall be put. As many as want to put the previous question say aye. Opposed, the same sign. The motion is carried.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT (Wash.): I do not agree with Delegate Williams of Minnesota. I think we need a little more than our National Executive Committee, and even our National Committee, this convention does. Now, it is not a question as to whether or not the first section of this article states the qualifications for membership, but it is a question as to whether or not we shall have a pledge, an official pledge, a constitutional pledge, a pledge provided for in the constitution, so that no state can say, "This is our pledge," when that pledge may not be a pledge that is in conformity with Socialist Party principles, according to the constitution at present. By that I mean this, according to the

constitution of the Socialist Party, with that pledge left out, anybody can say he believes in our principles and can thereby become a member without any other qualifications.

(An interruption.)

DEL. WAGENKNECHT: I will speak my full five minutes, if you please.

DEL. GAYLORD: Of course you will. Go on.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT: Thank you. It seems to me to be the opinion here that the different state organizations can take into the party anybody they please. Now, I say we should have a uniform pledge. We should make the person who wishes to join our party sign this pledge. We should make a person who wishes to join our party understand that the only way he can join our party is by signing the Socialist Party pledge. Now, the only way you can make this positive is by making a law, and the only way you can make a law is by including a pledge in the constitution.

Question called for.

THE CHAIRMAN: According to the motion that was passed with reference to the previous question, no other speaker would be in order. As many as are in favor of the amendment offered by the delegate—

A DELEGATE: A point of information. Has the National Executive Committee done away with the pledge cards entirely?

DEL. SLOBODIN: No, we have got them anyhow.

DEL. KUNATH (Ind.): I ask if this pledge that has just been read is not the uniform application card that is issued by the national office?

THE CHAIRMAN: It is the regular pledge, which seems to be not provided for anywhere else in the constitution.

DEL. GAYLORD: I want to ask the comrades or the chairman if anybody can answer whether the adoption of this would compel the Social Democratic Party of Wisconsin to use this form. We could not use it there. What would we do? The name of our party is the Social Democratic Party.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT: Use

the pledge with "Social Democratic" in it.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair would suppose that Section 1 of Article I would necessarily cover that point.

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): According to that pledge I will have to sell my house and lot before I can get into the party.

THE CHAIRMAN: In answer to that I will say that we have all signed that pledge, every one of us.

DEL. KERR (Ill.): A question of information. Is it not true that the proposition of the comrade from Washington is but a reiteration of our pledge that we have already signed, all of us.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. Let me state; I will answer you. It is precisely the effort, as I understand it, of the comrade who introduced the resolution, to get a pledge into the constitutional law of the party.

DEL. KERR (Ill.): Yes, that is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: As many as favor the motion offered by the delegate from Washington say aye. Opposed, by the same. The motion is carried and it is so ordered. The committee will proceed.

DEL. HAZLETT (Mont.): I want to ask for information. You said that before we got through with Article II, I might present my amendment, and this is the place.

THE CHAIRMAN: Not necessarily. At any time when you have it finished, any particular time you ask for the floor I will see that you have it.

DEL. HAZLETT: This is the place to put in my amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you absolutely ready?

DEL. HAZLETT: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then we will hear Comrade Hazlett.

DEL. HOGAN (Ark.): Before we pass to Article III?

THE CHAIRMAN: Nothing is in order but the matter of Comrade Hazlett of Montana.

DEL. HAZLETT: I move that the first section of the article on membership shall be changed to read this way: "Every person, resident of the United States, of the age of eighteen years and upward, without distinction

of sex, race, color or creed, who has severed his connection with all other political parties, and subscribes to the principles of the Socialist party, including political action, shall be eligible to membership in the party." That every application for membership shall also include specifically that clause, belief in political action. Also that there shall be a section added to the membership article, a penalty clause to read like this:

"Section 6. Any person who opposes political action as a weapon of the working class to aid in its emancipation, shall be asked to withdraw from the party."

Amendment seconded. The reading of the amendment was received with applause.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair rules that the motion really includes three propositions, and with the consent of the mover and of the convention I would like to divide the motion. The first covering the amendment to Section 1; the second covering the amendment to the pledge, which would be our newly adopted Section 5; and the third, the Section 6 which is proposed to be added. Now, if the comrade will confine her remarks to the first part of that we will get that disposed of, and pass on and take them up one by one. They are really three propositions.

DEL. HAZLETT: I will do so, if I may be allowed to speak on each one, especially the last.

DEL. MILLER (Nev.): A point of order. The convention has already adopted an amendment as to discrimination in sex.

THE CHAIRMAN: She did not take that into consideration, but that is a matter which we all understand, as to the "distinction."

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): I move the previous question on the first clause.

Motion seconded by Del. Berlyn.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair would rule that Comrade Hazlett has the floor.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): She has the floor on the previous question, anyhow.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, she will have the floor afterwards, anyway.

You can yield if you want to right now. As many as favor the previous question, say aye. Opposed. It is so ordered.

DEL. HAZLETT: I simply want to state that when the time comes I wish to speak to the motion on the last part, on the necessity of having the phrase "political action" in the application and in the constitution. It seems to me that if we have this all persons who join the Socialist party will take a pledge that they believe in political action, and then if they interfere with that pledge in any way, if they violate that pledge we can then bring the penalty part of the motion that I made. That is all I have to say on that matter.

Asst. Sec. Reilly read the pending amendment, as follows:

"Moved by Hazlett of Montana to amend Article II, Section 1, to read: 'Every person, resident of the United States, of the age of eighteen years and upward, without discrimination as to sex, race, color or creed, who has severed his connection with all other political parties, and subscribes to the principles of the Socialist party, including political action, shall be eligible to membership in the party.'"

The amendment was put and carried.

ASST. SEC. DEL. REILLY: The second amendment of Comrade Hazlett, if adopted, would read the same as the amendment offered and adopted from Comrade Wagenknecht, with the exception of the pledge that the applicant would sign, that "I endorse the platform and constitution of the Socialist party, including the principle of political action."

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

Question called for.

DEL. OSBORNE (Cal.): A point of information. Have we any other action except political action in the Socialist party?

A DELEGATE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: As many as are in favor, say aye. Opposed, the same. The motion is carried and it is so ordered. The secretary will give us the third proposition.

ASST. SEC. REILLY: The third proposition is to add a new section, to be known as Section 6, that "Any

person in the party who opposes political action as a weapon of the working class to aid in its emancipation shall be asked to withdraw from the party."

DEL. SOLOMON (N. Y.): I oppose that amendment for the reason that any person who deliberately violates the constitution of the party cannot be asked to withdraw, but should be expelled, and I am opposed to any clause in the constitution that makes it optional with the various states to ask such a member to please kindly get out of the party. I therefore move to amend the motion or amendment, whatever it may be, to read that "any person violating the pledge or the clause of the constitution with regard to political action or any other action shall be expelled from the party." (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: An amendment is made and seconded. Discussion is now on the amendment. Will the Secretary read the amendment?

DEL. HAZLETT: It seems to me if this means that if any person violates the pledge in the amendment already adopted on political action such person is to be expelled, I will accept the amendment if I am allowed to speak on this amended clause.

DEL. SPARGO: I would like to ask whether that means if the amendment is in the terms offered by Del. Solomon?

A DELEGATE: Yes.

DEL. SPARGO: The terms offered by Del. Solomon are not as satisfactory, but Comrade Hazlett accepted them. It is not a question of any member violating the principle of political action, as I understand, but that any person opposing political action shall be expelled from the Socialist party. I believe that Comrade Solomon will accept that wording, and Comrade Hazlett will—

DEL. HAZLETT: Yes.

DEL. SPARGO—that any person opposing political action shall be expelled from the Socialist party.

DEL. HAZLETT: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment, then, is in the form stated by Comrade Spargo. Comrade Hazlett has the floor.

DEL. SMITH (Tex.): I wish to ask, would an amendment or a sub-

stitute for the whole be in order? We have now a motion, and an amendment to the amendment.

DEL. HAZLETT: I accepted in my motion the amendment.

DEL. SMITH: Would an amendment to the amendment be in order, then?

THE CHAIRMAN: An amendment is in order if the comrade has one to offer.

DEL. SMITH: I wish to amend the amendment to read that no state organization nor local organization in an unorganized state shall retain any member in its organization who has violated that clause of the constitution pertaining to the qualifications as regards political action. I do this because under our constitution the national organization would have no power to decline or rather to expel any party member.

THE CHAIRMAN: Del. Spargo, may I ask you, isn't that virtually all covered in your statement?

DEL. SPARGO: I merely ask that the motion and amendment be reconciled.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes; but isn't virtually all that the comrade states here covered in your amendment?

DEL. SPARGO: I think so.

DEL. HAZLETT: I wish to speak on my motion.

DEL. FARRELL (Ohio): A point of information. I would like to ask the chairman whether all the delegates here would have to sign another application? The obligation in the Socialist party does not declare for political action.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is no information that can be given, I think. It is a matter of private opinion, like religion. (Laughter.) It is not a question that I can answer or that anybody else can answer, but it is a matter of opinion. Del. Hazlett has the floor.

DEL. HAZLETT: Comrade Chairman and Comrades: While this is a new departure, I presume, in the history of the constitution of the American Socialist party, to present a penalty clause, I think we should do so because of the necessity that has arisen within the Socialist party itself. There has been some trouble in certain parts of this country already with

a very decided tendency to do away with the ballot as a means of emancipation of the working class. Especially in the locals in the western part of this country, those under the teachings of the Western Federation of Miners and the Industrial Workers of the World, do we find the party membership advocating direct action in place of political action. (Applause.) I have found this in a recent trip to the west. I have found it through the Nevada locals. I have found it in some of the mining locals, and I have found it on the coast; even to such an extent that certain persons in the local of Butte, have pointed with scorn to our members who are advocating the political party and have called them maniacs. I wish to say, since this has come up, since we are scorned for advocating the ballot, there is such a menace in it that I have heard persons speak on the coast—and one of the men is in this convention, who was a speaker for the Socialist party—that would stand up and say to a crowd, "We don't ask your votes and we don't care whether we have your votes or not." Now, since this is the condition we face, a condition that is spreading, the demand for direct action, saying that we will get nothing by the ballot and nothing can be achieved by the ballot, I say it is the direct child of those revolutionary tactics (applause) by which they do not want to do anything by political action in existing society. I wish to have the constitution of the American Socialist party so framed that we can send out the word to the locals throughout the country so that they will know, when any man gets on the floor of a local and begins to sneer at political action, that we shall have a guaranty of his expulsion from the party. (Applause.)

DEL. PREVEY (Ohio): Comrade Chairman and Comrades—

A DELEGATE: What's the matter with the women?

DEL. PREVEY: Let us get cooled off a little while and get our reasoning faculties in working order. What are we here for, in the first place?

A DELEGATE: Political action.

DEL. PREVEY: We are here as the representatives of the political

party. We are drafting a constitution in order that we may carry on the political party. When anyone signs an application saying that he subscribes to the principles of the Socialist political party, what in the name of common sense is he subscribing to? I would be ashamed to have the constitution of the Socialist party go out from this convention with a lot of superfluous language tacked on. (Applause.) I want an opportunity to speak on this clause before it is adopted, but owing to the fact that a whole lot of people here seemed to want to get up and show that they could make a Socialist speech, we wasted a lot of valuable time. (Applause.) Please don't applaud; I want all of my time. And now we are rushing through the most important part of this convention and drafting the means by which we are going to carry on the work of the Socialist party. In the name of common sense, let us give this careful consideration, and do not, in an important part of the work of this convention, in the constitution, make babies of ourselves. This is what clause that we are amending—

THE CHAIRMAN: We are on the addition of a new clause.

DEL. PREVEY: I believe the addition of a new clause. With the permission of those delegates, the addition of a new clause is directly concerned with what we have just adopted. I cannot make a motion, but I hope some other comrade will after I get through talking. The first clause I want to read because it bears a certain relation to the amendment that we are considering; that is why I want to read it: "Article II, Section 1. Every person, resident of the United States, of the age of eighteen years and upward, without distinction of sex, race, color or creed, who has severed his connection with all other political parties, and subscribes to the principles of the Socialist party, shall be eligible to membership in the party." What in the name of common sense have we got "party" in there for, if we don't mean political party? (Applause.) Why are we tacking a whole lot of superfluous language on there? It would read this way: "Subscribes to the principles of the

party, and who believes in political action." When we sign the application it means that we subscribe to the principles of the political party, and if there are any in the locals anywhere that do not believe in political action it is the duty of the comrades to throw them out of the window or somewhere else. (Applause.) Don't let us be babies, and I hope some comrade will have the good sense to offer a substitute for the whole. I cannot do it because it would not be according to parliamentary law. I move a reconsideration.

DEL. BRADFORD: A question of personal privilege. I do not desire to take up the time of the convention, but I feel that in justice to the California delegates and our constituents I should state that I do not know any of our brothers who is guilty of what Ida Crouch Hazlett has charged, and I do not believe it is true.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): If it is the desire of this convention to give the national organization jurisdiction over individual members, admitting them into the membership of the party or expelling them from the membership of the party, I think the constitution should so declare and it should be drafted with that end in view. But until now our constitution has no such provision. It was not contemplated to give the national organization jurisdiction over the members. In the state autonomy clause, it was provided that the respective states should have exclusive jurisdiction over individual members (applause), and the national organization should have jurisdiction over the state only. (Applause.) You can provide in your national constitution that the state constitutions shall include certain sections, and if they do not include them you can expel a state or discipline a state. You cannot discipline any member under the present constitution that we are working under or under the constitution as it was drafted by your committee. You cannot discipline a member of the party except a member of the National Committee or of the National organization. I wish Comrade Berger had taken a tumble to himself. If we were working under that clause he advo-

cates now there would have been at a certain time in the history of our party a motion made to expel him from the party, because outside of the State of Wisconsin he would not be a member of the Socialist movement, of the Socialist party. I do not know whether at the present time I am opposing such a mode of procedure or advocating it, but I say that is what that provision tends to, that is what it does. It says a member who acts in a certain way shall be expelled from the party, but you provide no mode of expelling him. What, will you do? You cannot tell the State of Wisconsin or the State of Montana to expel a member, for if the State of Wisconsin or the State of Montana refuses to expel, what can you do? Nothing. You have jurisdiction of the state. You can expel the State of Montana or the State of Wisconsin, that is all. Now, I say that under the scheme, under the principles involved in this constitution as to state autonomy, we should have no section providing for the expulsion of individual members of a state organization, but leaving that to the state organizations, and we should reserve to ourselves jurisdiction over the state organizations. If a state does not act as we have provided in this constitution, then we can take care of the state. The second proposition I oppose, as to political action. That is a matter of opinion, just as much as religion is. (Applause.) A man may be in our party and advocate anything he pleases. So long as he expresses an opinion merely he is not liable to expulsion. He is only responsible for acts; if he votes for the other party, or refuses to vote the Socialist party ticket when he has an opportunity to do so, and it is shown that he has done so. But we are not in a position to force him to take political action, and if he goes to his local and says, "I do not advocate or I am opposed to putting up a ticket at this time," and he votes so, he is not liable to expulsion, because then it is a question of opinion, and I would not expel a man for expressing his opinions. I am not in favor of adopting a clause in the constitution that a man may be expelled for expressing his opinion. Therefore I am

opposed to this amendment. (Applause.)

DEL. GOAZIOU (Pa.): I am opposed to the amendment offered. Whenever I get tired of political action I will withdraw from the Socialist party, and every honest man should do the same. (Applause.) Now, I believe in political action, but if political action will only be to secure votes and elect a few men to office without having Socialism in view, then you will have more people who will be opposed to political action. A statement has been made by the comrade from Montana that there is a great number of people who are becoming opposed to political action, due to the fact that there is more opportunism in the Socialist party today than yesterday. (Applause.) If you will watch our movement from today on you will find that as opportunism grows, the opposition to political action will also grow. (Applause.) A few weeks ago I made a tour of the eastern states and the New England states where there was a large number of people who had just come from France, and we found that nearly every one of them was an anarchist, and every anarchist we found coming from France had come from the cities where we have had Socialist municipalities. They have come from the center of opportunism, where the Socialist party has been used simply to get office for a few individuals and not to further Socialism. (Applause.) And just as this has grown in France and every other country, you will find that opposition to the ballot will grow in this country. But I hope that if that day ever comes when I shall become opposed to political action, I will have the honesty to say, "My friends, I part with you and will not wait to be expelled from the Socialist party." But I hope that that day will never come, and that I shall continue to be a Socialist, trying to get Socialism and not office for a few individuals.

DEL. BARZEE (Ore.): I want to call your attention to the fact that this convention has been run by the intellectuals in this convention all the way through, and the further fact that you will find that the member-

ship, the proletariat, will themselves come here and destroy this thing four years from now. They will carry it into their home locals, and you will feel the pulse on what you are doing here before this is through.

DEL. LAURA B. PAYNE (Tex.): I am sorry that the feeling has arisen in this convention that we find here. It is more imaginary than anything else, and when we try to draw the dividing line between the opportunists and the impossibilists, the impossibilists are telling the opportunists that they are impossibilists, and vice versa, and they hardly know where they are. So far as that motion is concerned, I think it is absolutely unnecessary. Political action is understood, and I never heard that question raised before in my life concerning the political party, the Socialist party. I am constantly in the field and I know many others that are, and we are trying to induce the working people in every way to vote in their own interest, and that means political action. You have put it down here that black is black, and then down a little further you have to explain that black is black. It seems to me you have unnecessary words there and that you have put in something insisted on by a portion of this convention which is really unnecessary, even for the purpose for which you intended it, for you cover all political action that you need without that in there, and I think it would look better and sound better with that as it used to be, and I say just leave it out. (Applause.)

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): Comrade chairman and comrades, there is a growing tendency not only in this country, but in other countries, to deprecate political action. That tendency you can see in Italy and France, even in Germany to some extent, although less there than anywhere else, and in this country. The syndicalists in Italy fight political action. They call themselves Socialists and are members of the Socialist party. There is a strong element, or was at least, in this country, doing the same thing, and I have heard it pleaded many a time right in our own meetings by speakers that come

to our meetings, that the only salvation for the proletariat of America is direct action, that the ballot box is simply a humbug. Now, I don't know how this question is going to be solved. I have no doubt that in the last analysis we must shoot, and when it comes to shooting, Wisconsin will be there. We always make good. (Applause.) But I want you to understand that that is not a question for this party to decide.

A DELEGATE: That is right.

DEL. BERGER: We are to have a political party.

A DELEGATE: That is right.

DEL. BERGER: And we want to keep out of the party everybody who is not in harmony with our main principles and who is opposed to the fundamental idea of the party, which means the ballot box. In order to be able to shoot, even, some day, we must have the powers of the political government in our hands, at least to a great extent. I want that understood. So everybody who is talking to you about direct action and so on, and about political action being a humbug, is your enemy today, because he keeps you from getting the powers of political government. They talk about the opportunistic movement in Wisconsin, saying that we are bourgeois. Now, I want you to understand, brothers and delegates, that there is not a party in this country anywhere that is as clearly proletarian as the party in Milwaukee. (Applause.) Ninety-five per cent of our entire membership and of our voters are clearly trade union and laboring men, so much so that we have not even enough of the middle class, not enough lawyers, to fill our offices; so much so that from now on, if we are to grow, we must get some of what you call the middle class and intellectuals; although I will say that intellectually our movement in Wisconsin, and particularly in Milwaukee, is probably better educated than anywhere else in the country, for the simple reason that we do it all by literature. (Applause.) We have no soap-box orators. My oratory is a sample, you know. We do it by giving them Socialism, by giving them facts. We do it by literature, and lots of it. So, as far as education is

concerned or the principles of Socialism and the ability to talk on every question that comes up of every kind from a Socialist point of view, there is no party in the country that is as well educated as the Milwaukee party, although it is clearly proletarian. (Applause.) I will say this: if this was only a particular case, I would say it was sufficient to leave it out. But the spirit of anarchy and the spirit of impossibilism is growing in this country. I am not going to address myself to our friends, the populists, because I know they will be all right very soon, but there is another element now, similar to the syndicalists in the old country; and therefore, in order to state our position right in the beginning we ought to have this in the constitution. I beg you to accept the amendment of Comrade Hazlett, but in such a way as to make it compulsory on the state to expel a member, and so as to keep the principle of state autonomy under which our party grew to such fine proportions intact.

DEL. BAUER (Cal.): I wish to say one word against the proposed amendment, and it is this: this amendment can be directed only against one class of people.

A DELEGATE: The anarchists.

DEL. BAUER: Wait a minute; I am going to say what I want to say. The men who are honest and sincere, who want to join our party which is a political party—we don't have to have an iron-clad contract, and have them swear on a stack of bibles that they are going to vote for the ticket and support the political party. So that the amendment cannot apply to the honest and sincere; it can only apply to those who attempt to get into our party and who are insincere. It is known, and I maintain, that you cannot by a membership pledge of any kind control those who are insincere and dishonest; they will sign anything you may frame—the Pinkerton spy, the anarchist, if you please, or the impossibilist if you please, if he is insincere. The dishonest will come in anyhow, and you will have to fight it out inside of your organization.

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): I move

the previous questions. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The previous question will now be put. As many as favor it say aye. Opposed by the same sign. The motion is carried and it is so ordered. Del. Hazlett has the floor.

DEL. HAZLETT: I do not care to make a speech at all on this, because I have stated all my reasons for it. The things that have been said show that the amendment is a proper one. Comrade Bauer said that the persons in the Socialist party who are advocating direct action and who are decrying the ballot and political action are persons who are insincere and in the pay of citizens' associations, and spies, and so forth. That is not true. I will say of my personal knowledge that there are many people that are my friends, men I have known for many years, within the ranks of organized labor in this country, and that I do not think there are any in any place in the Socialist party who are more sincere or who believe what they say more than these men who are today advocating direct action. They are doing it because of the wrong teachings in our party.

DEL. YOUNG (Pa.): A point of information. I ask for a definition in English of "direct action."

A DELEGATE: "Anarchy."

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the phrase occur in the amendment?

A DELEGATE: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: It does not occur, and therefore the question cannot be asked at this time. The question now comes upon the adoption of the amendment, which is the addition of the sixth clause or section to Article II. The secretary will read the section.

ASST. SEC. REILLY: It is to add a new section to be known as Section 6 of Article II, to read that "any member of the party who opposes political action as a weapon of the working class to aid in its emancipation shall be expelled from membership in the party."

The question was put on the adoption of the amendment, and, a division being called for, it was adopted by a vote of 82 for and 48 against.

DEL. BRADFORD (Cal.): A

question of personal privilege. I do not desire to waste the time of this convention, but there has been a statement made here which, in manifest fairness to the comrades here and to the members of the movement in their state, we desire and we deserve an answer or a designation from the comrade on this floor who has made that statement.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is the statement that you refer to?

DEL. BRADFORD: A statement was made by Comrade Ida Crouch Hazlett that one of the members of the California delegation here present practically has repudiated direct action in his public utterances and taken a position for which one of our members in California is now under suspension from the party, and for which, if we allow this thing to be ignored and to have no statement of it in this convention, we will go back and be seriously handicapped in our work. I know I speak in behalf of several comrades here of the delegation, and I think I speak in behalf of all of them, in asking Comrade Hazlett to designate that member of our delegation.

A DELEGATE: A point of order. There are no charges made here unless they are made in writing, I understand.

THE CHAIRMAN: The comrade from California raises a point which the chair must permit, not because the delegate comes from California, but it seems to me in justice to any delegation, and the chair must ask the comrade from Montana, Comrade Hazlett, if she is willing to name the person in the California delegation to whom she referred, and give him an opportunity to either affirm or deny the charge.

DEL. ANDERSON (Minn.): A point of order. I do not believe the comrade said he was in the California delegation. She said it was in California.

DEL. HAZLETT: I do not wish to get any delegate or delegation in trouble at all, and I do not think I referred to the California delegation. I said in my speech, as far as that delegate was concerned, the delegate was a personal friend of mine and he has

not said any more than many persons in our party have said.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is whether you have here referred to the California delegation, and are you willing to say who?

Objection was made by different members.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): I object to the answer. I call for the regular order.

DEL. GERBER (N. Y.): A question of personal privilege. I want to be recorded in the minutes as voting in favor of the resolution just carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you send your name up?

A delegate made the point of order that the California matter was out of order and ought to be settled outside of the convention.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair desires to say that it is a question of personal privilege if the comrade did refer to California. If she did not refer to California it is not a question of personal privilege.

A DELEGATE: I object. It is not in the province of the California delegation to ask whether reference was made to any of the delegates present, as comrade Hazlett did not name the California delegation.

THE CHAIRMAN: If Mrs. Hazlett would say that one thing, whether she said California or not, it will settle it.

A DELEGATE: She is not asked to say it.

Objection by various delegates to any further proceedings in regard to the matter.

THE CHAIRMAN: A true question of privilege has been asked. Did Mrs. Hazlett say California or did she not?

DEL. HAZLETT: I did not say California.

THE CHAIRMAN: That settles the whole matter.

DEL. BARZEE (Ore.): A question of personal privilege and explanation. I am a member at present of the Socialist party. We have passed in this resolution or part of the program a provision that any person opposing political action shall be expelled from the party. I want to know what "opposition" is, so that I may be able to stay in the party.

THE CHAIRMAN: Please don't

ask questions that I am not competent and no one in this convention at this time is competent to answer.

DEL. BARZEE: The question was passed upon.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am not here nor is this convention here at this present time to interpret these matters. The order of business is to adopt this constitution or reject it, and any question as to what is in there is proper, but questions of opinion, questions of court decisions, we will not entertain.

Del. Gaylord then read the first section of the next article, as follows:

Article III.

Section 1. The affairs of the Socialist party shall be administered by a National Committee, its officers and executive committee, the party conventions, and the general vote of the party.

It was moved and seconded to adopt the section.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection? If not it is ordered adopted. Proceed.

The next section was read:

Section 2. Three years' membership in the party shall be necessary to qualify for all national official positions.

DEL. HAGEL (Okla.): I wish to insert the word "consecutive," so as to make it read "Three years' consecutive membership." (Amendment seconded.)

DEL. GAYLORD: The committee will accept that.

There being no objection, the section as amended was adopted.

The next article was read:

Article IV.

Section 1. Each organized state or territory shall be represented on the National Committee by one member and by an additional member for every 2,000 members or major fraction thereof in good standing in the party. For the purpose of determining the representation to which each state or territory may be entitled, the National Secretary shall compute at the beginning of each year the average dues paying membership of such state or territory for the preceding year.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection?

DEL. DAVIES (Pa.): I move to strike out 2,000 and insert 1,000. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: There is an amendment made and seconded that 1,000 be substituted for 2,000.

DEL. DAVIES: I am not going to take up any time, but I think 2,000 is entirely too much for the present strength of our organization. There are comparatively few states that have more than two National Committeemen, and not many at that. The average membership in any one state throughout the whole union, even excluding those unorganized, is not much more than 1,000, and you are going to have some weak states and you are going to have them with as much representation in the National Committee as the strongly organized states. Take, for instance, Pennsylvania or Ohio, states which have around 1,900 members. You are going to have some comparatively insignificant, numerically states having as much strength in the National Committee as those two. I am in favor of 2,000 when we have reached that stage. But I claim that we have not reached the 2,000 stage yet. I believe in time you will have 10,000 or 50,000, but that day is not yet. I think, in order to give states such as Pennsylvania, Ohio, Massachusetts and so on, a fair representation in the National Committee in proportion to their membership, the only way you can do that is to retain it at 1,000, so that the states with but two or three or four hundred members will not be as strong in the National Committee as those other states.

DEL. KUNATH (Ind.): Then increase your membership.

DEL. GAYLORD: There is one other item which I wish to call your attention to in the constitution which affects this, namely that we do not ask to have this constitution go into effect until the first of January, 1909. Second, we believe in the growth of this party. The party has been growing very rapidly in the last six months. We expect it to grow very much more rapidly in the next six months. The work of the National Committee is conducted by correspondence very largely. We ask that this be inserted for the sake of the effectiveness of the officers in the work of the National Committee.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): I want

to correct Comrade Davies when he states that a state which has but 400 members will be entitled to the same representation on the National Committee as Pennsylvania, with 1,900 members. That is not so. A state that has got only 400 members, according to this clause, will be entitled to one National Committeeman, and the state of Pennsylvania will be entitled to two. A state that has more than 2,000 members and less than 3,000 will be entitled to two National Committeemen. A state that has got more than 3,000 will be entitled to three.

The amendment was lost, and the section as reported was adopted.

The next section was read, as follows:

Section 2. The members of this committee shall be elected by referendum vote of and from the membership of the states or territories which they respectively represent. Their term of office shall not be more than two years. The members of the National Committee shall be subject to removal by referendum vote of their respective states.

It was moved to adopt the section.

DEL. MILLER (Nev.): In another section, in Article VI., it says, "they shall hold office for two years." Here is a positive statement that says that their term of office shall not be more than two years. Why not have them more alike? I move you that in this section just read we change it to read, "Their term of office shall be two years." (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded that the phraseology be that the term of office shall be two years.

DEL. SLAYTON: I want to explain why that is that way. The National Committeeman is a state officer. The constitution says he shall not hold office for more than two years, meaning that that leaves it to the state constitution and organization to provide if they want to that he hold office for only one year. But the National Executive Committeeman is a national officer, and therefore the constitution prescribes what the term shall be.

The amendment was lost, and the section as reported was adopted.

The next section was read:

Section 3. The National Committee shall meet whenever it shall deem it necessary to do so.

Adopted without objection.

The next section was read:

Section 4. Expenses of the National Committeemen in attending meetings shall be paid from the national treasury.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection it will be adopted. So ordered.

A DELEGATE: What does that mean, "expenses?"

THE CHAIRMAN: It means all expenses.

The next section was read:

Section 5. No motion shall be submitted to a referendum of the National Committee by correspondence unless supported within thirty days by not less than five members of the National Committee from three different states.

Minority Report.

DEL. GAYLORD: On this point there is a minority report. You will find it in the first section of the minority report. It is recommended by Comrade Bell, and I think also Comrade Snyder. It reads: "To eliminate from Section 5, Article IV, sixth line, the words 'from different states.'" It would then mean that five members from any state or states could support a motion for the referendum by correspondence and it would go to the ballot.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand that the minority report is moved as an amendment. It is now up for discussion.

DEL. GERBER (N. Y.): I move that the report of the majority be adopted. (Seconded.)

DEL. HERMAN (Wash.): Wouldn't this mean that it would be before the National Committeemen for thirty days?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, it says "within thirty days."

DEL. GAYLORD: Just as soon as there are five supporting members from three different states the vote can be taken.

The motion to adopt the majority report was carried.

Section 6 was read, as follows:

Section 6. The National Committee shall adopt its own rules of procedure not inconsistent with the provisions of this constitution.

Adopted without objection.

DEL. FARRELL (Ohio): I would like to say with reference to Section 3

in regard to the National Committee meeting, that it should specify in what way they shall do business, whether by majority rule or not. But I presume Section 6 will cover that.

DEL. GAYLORD: That will cover that.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection it is adopted. So ordered.

At this point the chairman announced that the ballots on the Committee on Farmers' Program and Committee on Immigration could be collected, and they were accordingly collected.

The chairman of the Committee on Constitution then read Article V, Section 1, of the proposed constitution as follows:

Section 1. The duties of this committee shall be to represent the party in all national and international affairs; to call national nominating conventions and special conventions decided upon by the referendum of the party; to make reports to the national convention; and to receive and pass upon all reports and actions of the Executive Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to this section? I hear no objection and it is adopted as read.

The chairman of the committee then read Section 2 as follows:

Section 2. The National Committee shall neither publish nor designate any official organ.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection? I hear no objection and the section is adopted as read.

DEL. GAYLORD: Article VI—under this first section there is a minority report. I will read the section first as reported by the committee:

Section 1. The National Executive Committee shall be composed of seven members, elected by the National Committee from the membership of the party, and they shall hold office for two years. The call for nominations and elections shall be issued in the month of November of even numbered years.

Under this section there is a minority report to the effect that there should be struck out from Section 1, Article VI, the words "the National Committee" and substitute therefor the words "referendum vote."

DEL. CLARK (Tex.): I move that the minority report be adopted.

The motion was seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded that the minority report be adopted.

DEL. CLARK: The reason I make the motion is because we as a party claim that the Socialist Party is a democratic party, and stands for the election of our officers by the referendum. If we are a democratic party let us stay with those principles and let us stand against any effort that looks like—I don't mean that the majority report intended to do it; I don't say that they had it in their mind, but it looks like we are drifting toward the centralization of power, and let us strike at anything that even looks as if it had a tendency in that direction; let us stand as a party that is ruled by the majority and assert that the rank and file have the absolute right to say who shall be the National Executive Committee. Let us hold this thing down to the rank and file and not let the power be concentrated in a few hands, not build up something that smacks of a political machine in the Socialist Party.

If we let the rank and file control we shall be all right, they are the only ones who will always guide us right and if we take away from the rank and file the least part of their powers we are treading upon dangerous ground, and I think we ought to substitute the minority report for the majority report. Let us stand for the rank and file and let them have a voice in this matter. At least I hope you will adopt that minority report.

DEL. PREVEY: I want to speak in opposition to the amendment; not that I am in favor of the National Committee electing the National Executive Committee so much, but because I believe the manner in which the election of the National Executive Committee took place the last time we elected one was too cumbersome, too expensive and took up too much of the valuable time of our national officers. Comrades, I believe in democracy in the party but I also believe in a practical democracy; I believe in a democracy with which we can do business. I believe we can carry this worship of the name democracy to a point where it is supremely ridiculous. We use up the funds of the party, take up the time of our officers who should be doing propaganda work making them do this sort of thing

when they ought to be engaged in more important work.

I am not afraid of the members of the Socialist Party. I do not think that any delegate to this convention should be afraid of the Socialist Party. We always have the power to recall an officer; we always have the right to initiative and referendum and we can recall any of our officers at any time. I don't think we should be so suspicious of each other.

I am opposed to the amendment because I believe we should concentrate our efforts as much as possible in harmony with Socialism to the propaganda of Socialism rather than waste so much valuable time in electing officers.

I was in Chicago when the national office was compiling the work connected with the work of electing the National Executive Committee. I know that they had to work until 2 o'clock many mornings to compile that vote. It was also very expensive.

I am opposed to the amendment, but I had hoped that the committee would bring in some plan, something better than the election of the National Executive Committee by the National Committee. But I believe that we should vote down this amendment and some of us should offer something as a substitute, better than the amendment and better than the majority report.

But this amendment would simply leave the situation as it is now. I am opposed to it for that reason, because I don't want to use up our forces in electing our officers.

DEL. CARR (Ill.): I have in mind to move presently, in order to meet Comrade Prevey's suggestion, that supposing this minority report is adopted, that the committee be elected by a referendum, but from nominations made by at least ten branches. That will obviate the difficulty presented in the arguments of Comrade Prevey.

I am very much in favor of democratic management of the Socialist Party, and therefore, not to take your time in making a longer speech, I am in favor of the minority report and when it is voted upon I want the floor to move this proposition, that the members of the Executive Committee to be elected by referendum shall be nominated by at least ten branches.

DEL. KNOPFNAGEL (Ill.): I am

not a business democrat. I want Socialist democracy, not business democracy. I do not want the National Committee to have too much power over the party. I want the rank and file to elect both the National Committee and the Executive Committee and if we put into the hands of the National Committee the power to elect the National Executive Committee we have no power over either committee. One will wash their hands of the other and the other will wash their hands of the first. I want to get rid of the sort of thing we have had in the past, and for that reason I am in favor of social democracy and not business democracy.

They talk about expending money. The money comes from the rank and file and not from the committeemen. They are engaged to do the work of the party and if they don't want to do the work of the party they can get out. For these reasons I shall vote for the minority report.

DEL. REILLY (N. J.): There is such a thing as democracy running wild. It is also not always advisable for members of little or no experience in party affairs to have the same voice as members who are experienced.

Cries of "Good" and "No," "No."

DEL. REILLY: For instance, in the state where I come from, we won't allow a member of the party to vote on a state referendum on less than six weeks' membership.

The National Executive Committee is really a body that is created for convenience merely to transact business that the National Committee itself otherwise would transact; and in its very nature its acts must be subject to the approval of the National Committee. I respectfully submit to you that if the National Committee is to pass upon the acts of the National Executive Committee, the National Committee should also pass upon the election of that body that is to transact its business.

Now, comrades, there is another point. I deny that under the referendum system the rank and file of the party have been choosing our National Executive Committee. When I say this I do not wish to be construed as making a personal attack upon anybody. But take the last time that we elected a National Executive Committee. The highest candidate upon that ticket only received a vote of one-sixth of the mem-

bership of the party. He undoubtedly received a plurality of the votes that were cast, but, comrades, you cannot get a referendum on a matter that makes it as cumbersome as the election of the National Executive Committee is bound to be and have it efficient; you cannot get the majority of our members to leave their more important work to vote upon the election of the National Executive Committee.

DEL. CLARK: I move the previous question.

DEL. TUTTLE (Wis.): Everything that has been said against democracy and against the referendum has been said every time by every one who was ever interested against people taking part in or taking care of their own affairs.

A DELEGATE: I object to such an insinuation.

DEL. TUTTLE: I have not made any insinuation. If I have I would like to know what it is. I object to any such imputation unless you back it up with proof. I want it understood that I stand for democracy in this movement.

A DELEGATE: A point of order. The gentlemen are not discussing the question before us; they are quarreling.

THE CHAIRMAN: The delegate is discussing the matter before the house.

DEL. TUTTLE: I am doing the best I can and you will excuse me if I can't do any better. I am opening myself to you and you can judge of me all the better. They said here upon the platform that we are not really electing our officers by the referendum, and when we proved that we were, then they tell us we should not do it anyhow. What kind of a thing is this, that we can't do it and are not doing it, that we have done it wrong, and we can't do it anyhow? I am in favor of doing it and I don't care how cumbersome it is. I want the people to have the right of referendum. I am not afraid of this today, but I am afraid of it tomorrow. It is not what we are doing today that I fear, but it is because we go in and chop out this path, this calf path, and that is the path set for us to take and because the sheep walk through once we all follow. I don't want a precedent set, that there is anything better than the referendum and therefore I stand

for the referendum and I am going to vote for the minority report.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): The cheapest way to get popular with the masses is to get up and shout and scream and get yourself red in the face crying: "Hurrah for the people," "Hurrah for the rank and file," "Hurrah for the referendum."

I have voted for real democracy in the Socialist organization longer than some of those who are shouting so much for democracy. I have had spittoons hurled at me because I stood for it. I have also studied democracy and I have arrived at certain conclusions. Democracy without the mechanism by which it can express itself defeats its own end. Democracy to be efficient must find a mechanism by which it can express itself. That is the first principle of scientific democracy. It is the people who have come from other organizations into the Socialist ranks who sometimes make these mistakes.

I stand for democracy just as much as any of them. I do not doubt the sincerity of those who talk so loudly for democracy, but I say it again that we must find a means by which this democracy can express itself, and change its expression whenever it wants to.

Here you have a scheme of organization in this constitution. You have the National Committee with its members elected by the rank and file. They are also removable at any time by the rank and file. You go farther and you find from experience that the National Committee is the committee that must transact the executive business of the National organization and therefore you determine that the National Committee shall have its Executive Committee. Then what did you do? One time the Executive Committee was elected by a referendum. At that time I said and still think that it is not the best way of electing. But I was denounced up and down the country as an intellectual, and you, comrades, can see how wrong that accusation was. What was the result? Your National Executive Committee elected by the referendum vote assumed the function of a legislative body. It did more than the National Committee ever assumed to do. It passed resolutions of a fundamental character, on questions of principle, binding upon the Socialist Party. It assumed to instruct the delegates in the

International Congress and to pass upon questions that would come up there. Yet they have no more to do with legislative work than had your national secretary. But they assumed to pass upon questions of principle. Why? Because it was exalted in its own estimation by the fact that it was elected by a referendum vote. That came from the fact that you elected for the same purpose two committees with co-ordinate powers and not one subordinate to the other, because the National Committee is in charge of the party organization and the National Executive Committee was also. So I am in favor of the report.

DEL. WOODBY (Cal.): It seems to me that this whole thing can be amicably settled by having the National Committee, which is elected by a referendum, elect its own executive committee from its own number. Let me explain what I mean by that. Every one of us is elected by the referendum who comes to this convention. We come to this convention and then as a method of doing business we select certain committees who are to expedite our work. But we select them from those who have already been elected by a referendum. Now, if the National Committee, which is elected by a referendum, in its method of doing business is allowed to elect its own executive committee, but from its own number, we then secure all that we are arguing about, it seems to me, without the necessity of taking a further referendum to elect the members of the executive committee.

I would like to see the Executive Committee elected from the National Committee, and made responsible to the National Committee, so that the National Committee, if it did not like the work of the Executive Committee, could undo that work, just the same as if we don't like the work of a special committee of this convention we can change its work from the floor of the convention or dismiss them altogether and select another committee.

It seems to me that in that way we secure all that we want on both sides without the expenses and cumbersome work of electing a national executive committee and yet have the executive committee responsible to the National Committee.

If the two committees differ from each other now, then the National Com-

mittee has no power whatever to reverse the action of the Executive Committee, if they are at loggerheads. Do you understand me?

Suppose we had committees to take care of our business that we cannot very well handle in committee of the whole, if we have no power to dismiss that committee at all, and we get here at loggerheads, then we can accomplish nothing at all.

I want to repeat it again, so that you can see what I am after. Elect the National Committee by referendum and then have the National Committee, merely as a method of doing business select from those men that the people have already elected by referendum, an executive committee responsible to them for their action. It seems to me that secures the whole thing. I would like to offer as a substitute for both the minority and the majority report: "The National Committee shall select its executive committee from its own number."

DEL. SNYDER (Kan.): As one in the minority I wish to speak in favor of the amendment. It is said that I am a crank, but I desire to say that if there is any difficulty with the rank and file it is because they have not had the opportunity to practice democracy enough. The officials have too much power because democracy is not spread enough. I know of no other way to get practical democracy before the rank and file better than to have this idea of the referendum spread among them. I don't care how many times you send out a referendum to the rank and file, it does some good. It helps to educate the membership in looking after its officials. If you put into the hands of a few men the power to elect their executive committee and their financial secretary and so on, you put it out of the hands of the rank and file and eventually they will do with that just as they do with their state secretaries and others; they will let them do all the work and lose sight of the organization. This keeps them acquainted, and that long list of names—I think we had 125 names submitted, but they get the rank and file acquainted with the membership of the Socialist Party, with the leaders of the Socialist Party of this country and it does more in that way than anything else you could think of.

I say I am in favor of keeping the

power in the membership of the party as far as possible and I believe we should strike out "National Committee" and substitute "Referendum vote."

There is no use in talking. Any person who knows the power that rests in the officials of our party today knows that the officials have too much power. Today I could throw the whole state of Kansas into absolute confusion for the next year. I could simply stop the whole campaign, because it is in my power as state secretary to put out the whole vote at the present time, at a time that comes before the primary next August. There is only the time between now and the 22d of June, and the membership could not possibly find me out in time if I saw fit to do that. So I want to get them so well acquainted with the officialdom of our party so that no such situation can ever come by some officials acting improperly. It is for this educational feature that we ought to keep this in. Let us first get real powerful democratic action before we put too much power in the hands of our officials. I am for the minority report.

DEL. SPARGO (N. Y.): I desire to speak in favor of the election of the National Executive Committee by the members of the National Committee whose executive body it is to be.

I am not at this time disposed to admit that there is that danger of despotism from officialdom in our Socialist Party. I say if it is true of Kansas, or of any other state in this union, then it is time that the comrades in those states began to mend their fences. But it is not true of the National organization of the Socialist Party.

I say to you, comrades, that so far as our State of New York is concerned, for example—and I doubt not that that state is representative of the vast majority of the states—no man who is state secretary can override the wishes of the membership of the party.

Now, to the question. What is it that we have to face? Why do we have a National Executive Committee? We have a National Committee as the legislative body of our party between conventions. That National Committee is too large, too unwieldy to carry on all of its business efficiently. For one thing, it is too expensive for the party membership to bring them together as often as a committee must meet. Now, if your National Committee is to be

anything more than a farce, comrades, you must say to that National Committee, "Choose you the men whom you will make your executive officers," or else what happens? You elect one body, the National Committee, by a referendum vote, and then you ask for a referendum vote of the party again on the question of an executive committee. What do we find? We find that under the rule of democracy, so called—it is not democracy but its perversion mobocracy—we find that under that mobocracy which takes the place of democracy in the minds of some of our party membership, we have Colonel Dick Maples nominated for the highest position in our party and polling a thousand votes when he is not even a member of the party.

Comrades, where are you going? Here we have right in our own state of New York men nominated, mainly by people living far away from New York, who have simply been misled by the glamor of a name or newspaper talk; and thus men out of touch with the party life, out of touch with its spirit, are elected to carry on the work of the party over and above the men who have been chosen on the National Committee.

If you want a political party I ask you to set efficiency above mobocracy; if you want a political party I ask you to set organization above anarchy, common sense above demagogism.

DEL. GOEBEL (Pa.): I want to be perfectly frank in this matter. I would sooner see the Socialist Party go to destruction through the mistakes of its membership than be saved by the leadership of some Moses. In the second place, I want you to state facts and not simply finespun theories. We used to have a method of electing the executive committee which resulted as indicated by Comrade Spargo. But we changed it by a referendum vote of the membership the country over. Why did we change it? There must have been a reason. We knew the reason. You know the reason. In the last two years, under this new method of electing the Executive Committee with the rank and file voting for them, what did we have? We are told that we can't do business if we are required to vote. Can anyone tell me in the history of the party where the party has made

more progress than during the last two years with the National Executive Committee elected by the rank and file? Not only that. We have had something else, a greater thing, the assurance that we do not need a lot of self-appointed Moseses. What else happened? The old method is absolutely unfair. I have recently come from New England. New Hampshire, in my honest judgment, has not sixty members paying dues, but it elects a member of the National Committee. That National Committee man has as much power in determining and shaping the policy of the party as one who comes from New York with 2,000 members. Is that fair, is that honest? Is that democracy? Is that standing for the rank and file? I stand for the rank and file with all its mistakes, even with all the mistakes, for with all their mistakes they come in the long run nearer to doing the right thing than the gentlemen who tell us we must be saved from ourselves. Don't forget the two years' of progress under a National Executive Committee elected by the rank and file who don't know how to do things.

DEL. BERLYN (Ill.): I want democracy. And I also want to protest against these insinuations against the Committee on Constitution, who are called officialdom. Not one of them is in the pay of the Socialist Party,—of the National party,—not one. I have been elected by the delegates at this convention on the Constitution Committee. To that committee I have brought such knowledge and experience as I have, to express the opinion of the membership that I come in contact with, and tried, as nearly as I could, to get that into the party constitution. It is delightful of Comrade Goebel to make the comparison between the National Committeeman of New Hampshire and the National Committeeman from New York. He says that is not democracy, and that the National Committeeman from New Hampshire is only elected by sixty votes, and the National Committeeman from New York by two thousand, or a portion of two thousand, because I believe they have four members. But the same Comrade Goebel wants some important functions of the party to be put in the hands of the National organizers, who are only appointees. Now, don't you forget that. That is favoring democracy! When it

is me, why then it goes; when it isn't, then it doesn't go.

Democracy is something like India rubber. You can stretch it any way you like. I have got a taste of your referendum business right in my cigar workers' union. Socialists obtained a victory about fourteen years ago, and we have established everything by the referendum. Yet, they robbed us of our convention, and after a referendum they established an oligarchy that it would take the force of a revolution to abolish, and that was all done in the name of democracy. You are very inconsistent in this matter. You want a National Executive Committee and you want a National Committee. If you don't want a National Committee, abolish it, but if you must have a National Committee, then let them control the National Executive Committee, and then if we are dissatisfied with the work of the National Committee selected by the various states, you won't by a referendum vote; if we should be dissatisfied with the work of the National Executive Committee, and receive protest from the membership against certain actions of the National Executive Committee, and we wanted to get busy, we wanted to respond to this sense of democracy, to respond to our constituents who have elected the National Committee, then the National Executive Committee is shielded by the National referendum, and their time of office would be expired before we could set in motion the machinery to remove them. If the National Committee had control, which they ought to have—I don't want to be on it any more; I don't want to be on the National Committee, but I have been there through the referendum vote of my constituency, but if the National Committee is to have control, you must put it in the hands of the National Committee, and then if there is any general dissatisfaction among the members in the various states, they can set the machinery in motion to compel the National Committee to take such action as would respond to their wishes.

Your ideal of democracy is all right where perfect discussion can take place, and where the questions can all be thrashed out, where the people can come together as they do in Switzerland, with their umbrellas, and vote on any question they want to. But you can't

have a referendum in the United States and call all the people together from all parts of the country and have one big mass meeting and settle it. For heaven's sake, act in the line of common sense and reason; keep democracy at the bottom as the basis, but keep the organism acting efficiently, and let each organ of the body respond to the action of all the others. That is the only way you will get efficiency.

COMRADE GAYLORD: I wish to read for the information of some of the delegates from Article IV:

"Section 1. Each organized state or territory shall be represented on the National Committee by one member, and by an additional member for every two thousand members or major fraction thereof in good standing in the party."

I also want to read to you the last clause of Section 2:

"The members of the National Committee shall be subject to removal by referendum vote of their respective States."

The members of your constitution committee have been accused of having intellect, and we plead guilty to the charge. I just want you to listen a moment. We believe in democracy, but we do not believe in democracy as a fetish. Democracy has been applied in this convention to some extent, and even here sometimes I have seen votes carried with a whoop and a hurrah without even properly knowing what they were voting about. I see some who applaud vigorously whenever democracy and the referendum are mentioned, who in private conversation with me, have played upon the phrase, "The masses," and punned upon it, spelling it with the "m" removed from the last word and attached to the first word—you can make your own pronunciation. I was a little astonished. It is in this way that we learn who are the people who do believe in democracy. I believe in both democracy and efficiency. In discussing the wording of the constitution in committee, we conceived that the National Committee is the hand of the party membership, it is the hand with which the party does its business. We also conceived that the National Committee cannot very well transact the minute details of the National office, the attending to the bookkeeping, buying stationery, putting the National

Secretary under bond, and seeing that it is done. We conceive that the National Committee must have a hand also to attend to these things. Some things may be done by correspondence. But the National Committee must have a hand, and that hand must be the Executive Committee. You will find as we go farther that we provided a hand, if you please, for the National Executive Committee, in the National Secretary. Further, we give him authority to secure his own assistants in his office. That is logical. It all goes together, and is one piece. It is not contradictory at any point, and back of it all you have quicker control over the National Secretary or his clerks through the recall of your National Committeeman, than you have by a National referendum.

DEL. FARRELL (Ohio): I move the previous question.

The motion was seconded by several delegates.

THE CHAIRMAN: The previous question has been moved. All those in favor of the motion that the main question be now put, say "aye." Those opposed, "no." The "ayes" have it, and the previous question is ordered.

DEL. CLARK (Texas): What we want to do is to get down to business, and not go back to Dick Maples. If we had been conducting referendums in this party and been doing it constantly, and had enough of them the party membership would have found out that Col. Dick Maples was not a member of the Socialist Party. And the fact that we were not doing it, left us entirely ignorant of whether Colonel Maples was a member of the party. But bear in mind that a majority of the voters found out readily that Dick Maples was not a member, and we have a way of keeping a man from taking a position even if he is elected, so there is no danger of Dick Maples getting control of the party, even though the rank and file don't know who are their members. There is a way of heading them off, and hence there is no danger on that score.

The position taken by Comrade Snyder was not that he could ultimately overthrow the wishes of the people of Kansas, but his position was that he could do it in a way that their purpose would be thwarted to a great extent before they would find out what he had done, and that he could for the time

throw the state into confusion. Yet they would find it out in the long run, but they would not do it quick enough to prevent the confusion.

This all comes down from one question. It means that if the National Committee elects the National Executive Committee and thereby deprives the rank and file of the control of the National Executive Committee, the result must be that you have delegated all your power to the National Committee, because if the people who compose the rank and file of the National movement are not allowed to choose the National Executive Committee, it is evident that you have delegated your power to the National Committee, and they in turn, have used that power in a way that is not in harmony with the real principles of the referendum or of the Socialist Party. It makes no difference who you elect, or how you do the voting. I am one of the fellows that believe that the rank and file of the Socialist Party of the United States will not go wrong ultimately. They may do it occasionally, as in the case of Dick Maples, but ultimately they will not do wrong, but when we delegate the power to a certain small body of men, they may do the wrong thing. For the sake of democracy, I say leave it to the rank and file.

Democracy has been laughed at here. I regret to say that that term has been laughed at by men who stood on this floor. But the term "democracy" means a great deal to the rank and file of the Socialist Party, and these people who have criticised this term are not the friends of the democracy that is dear to the hearts of the men who make up the Socialist Party of the United States.

Keep down this idea of concentration and the future of the Socialist Party is safe.

Comrades, do you agree with the men who believe in business, who believe in expediting matters, who believe that those at the head of this organization know more how to run the affairs of the Socialist Party than the working-class rank and file? I tell you that the man who says that thinks that those who compose the National Executive Committee know how to run the affairs of the party better than the rank and file. I would rather risk the affairs of the party in the hands of the wooden shoe common farmer on Spiny creek,

than the individual who makes that assertion.

Turn this down, for Heaven's sake! Don't delegate your powers to the head of the organization, but keep it down with the wooden shoe men, if you please.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is now upon the adoption of the minority report.

DEL. REILLY (N. J.): The motion is on the adoption of the minority report, which is to strike out the words "National Committee" and substitute the words "referendum vote," and the sense of it is that the National Executive Committee shall be elected by a referendum vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

Cries of "division," "division."

THE CHAIRMAN: As many of you as are in favor of the adoption of this minority report will raise their right hands.

DEL. CLARK: Remember you are voting for the people.

DEL. GOEBEL: Let us have a roll call and put them on record on this.

THE CHAIRMAN: The convention is to adjourn at 6 o'clock, but the delegate desires a twenty-minute roll call.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT (Wash.): A point of order. The roll call cannot be demanded at any moment.

DEL. SLOBODIN: I move that the roll call be taken.

The motion was seconded, and carried.

The Secretary then called the roll as follows:

Yes:—ARK., Hogan, Le Fevre, Snow; ARIZ., Cannon, Morrison; CAL., Cole, Starkweather; COLO., Maynard, Buie, Floaten, Miller; DEL., Henck; GA., Wilke; IDAHO, Chenoweth, Rigg; ILL., Hunt, Knopfnagel, Carr; IOWA, Work, Hills; KAN., Snyder, Brewer, Katterfeld; KY., Seeds; LA., Hymes; MICH., Stirton; MINN., Nieminen; MO., Callery; MONT., Westleder, Peura; NEB., Porter; NEV., Miller; N. J., Goebel, Strobell; N. Y., Lewis, Fieldman, Furman, Klenke; N. C., Quantz; OHIO, Ziegler, Devine; OKLA., Branstetter (O. F.), Ross, Dome, Block, O'Hare; PA., Young; R. I., Hurst; TENN., Vose; TEXAS, McFadin, Bell, Payne, Clark, Buchanan, Rhodes, Thompson; UTAH, Leggett; VT., Wilson; VA., Dennett; WASH., Hendrickson, Boomer; WIS., Thomas,

Melms, Berger, Thompson, Tuttle, Sandburg, Jacobs; WYO., Groesbeck.

No:—ALA., Waldhorst; CAL., Bradford, McDevitt, Wheat, Woodby, Tuck, Merrill, Osborne, Johns, McKee, Bauer; CONN., Smith; FLA., Pettigrew; ILL., Collins, Bentall, Berlyn, Kerr, May W. Simons, A. M. Simons, Smith, Korngold; IND., Dunbar, Kunath; IOWA, Rohrer, Brown; ME., Pelsey; MASS., Konikow; Eliot White, D'Orsay; MINN., Peach, Kaplan, Thorsett, Ingalls, Williams, Anderson; MO., Hoehn, Brandt, Pope; MONT., Graham, Hazlett, Ambrose, Harvey, Powers; N. J., Kearns, Krafft, Reilly; N. Y., Solomon, Wanhope, Lee, Slobodin, Paulitsch, Gerber, Spargo, Strebel, Fuhrman; OHIO, Prevey, Cowan, Bandlow, Vautrim, Jones, Farrell, Hayes; OKLA., Hagel, Davis, Boylan, Wills; ORE., Barzee, Ramp; PA., Adams, Clark, Davies; UTAH, Syphers; WASH., Herman, Wagenknecht, Krueger, Downie, Martin; W. VA., Houston; WIS., Gaylord, Weber, Heath; WYO., O'Neill.

Absent:—ALA., Freeman; ARK., Perrin, Penrose, Jones; CONN., Schieldge; IDAHO, Untermann; ILL., Brower, Fraenckel, Morgan, Stedman, Walker; IND., Strickland, Reynolds; IOWA, Shank; KAN., Wilson, McAlister; MD., Toole, Lewis; MASS., Carey, Hitchcock, Dan White, Mahoney, Putney, Cutting, Fenton; MICH., Lockwood, Menton, Hittunen; MINN., Rose, Maattala, Macki; MO., Garver, Behrens, Lipscomb; N. H., Wilkins, Arnstein; N. J., Killingbeck; N. M., Metcalf; N. Y., Hillquit, Hunter, Hanford, Vander Porten, Peiser, Cole; N. D., Bassett, Anderson; OKLA., Winnie E. Branstetter, Edwards, Reynolds; ORE., Varner, Ryan, Crabtree; PENN., J. E. Cohen, G. N. Cohen, Foley, Moore, Maurer, Ringler, Slayton, Schwartz; S. D., Atwood, Knowles; TEXAS, Holman, Smith; WASH., Brown.

DEL. FIELDMAN (N. Y.): I wish to change my vote from yes to no.

The Secretary then announced the vote as cast to be 69 "yes" and 83 "no."

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair declares the motion to substitute is lost.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): I desire to have it put on record that 66 of the delegates are already out of the Convention, that is, one-third of the membership gone.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question now is upon the motion that we adopt

the Committee's report on this section. All those who favor the Committee's report will say "aye;" those opposed "no." The "ayes" have it, and it is carried. The report of the committee is adopted.

DEL. GAYLORD: There is another minority report which you will find in the printed copy of the Constitution, and in all fairness to Comrade Bell, who spent considerable time in working it out, it should be considered. It is a method of preferential voting. You have it there and you understand what it is. I will not read it unless the Convention calls for it.

THE CHAIRMAN: The report of the majority on that section has been adopted.

DEL. GAYLORD: Article VI, Section 2.

"DUTIES OF NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE."

"Section 2. The duties of the National Executive Committee shall be to supervise and direct the work of the National Secretary; to organize unorganized states and territories; to receive and pass upon the reports of the National Secretary, and to transact all current business of the National office, except such as is by this constitution expressly reserved for the National Committee, or the general vote of the party. The National Executive Committee shall also formulate the rules and order of business of the National Convention of the party not otherwise provided for by this constitution, subject to adoption or amendment by the conventions."

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection? The section is adopted.

DEL. GAYLORD: Section 3.

"Section 3. The Executive Committee shall adopt its own rules of procedure not inconsistent with this constitution or with the rules of the National Committee."

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection the section will be adopted. There is no objection, and it is so ordered.

DEL. GAYLORD: Section 4.

"Section 4. The Executive Committee shall transmit copies of the minutes of its meetings to all members of the National Committee, and all its acts and resolutions shall be subject to

the revision of the National Committee."

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection the section will be adopted. It is so ordered.

DEL. GAYLORD: Section 5.

"Section 5. The National Executive Committee shall meet whenever it shall deem it necessary to do so. Between sessions all its business shall be transacted by correspondence."

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection the section will be adopted. There is no objection and it is so ordered.

DEL. BELL (Tex.): Will my proposed method go into the records?

DEL. GAYLORD: It goes in as part of the minority report.

The Bell minority report was as follows:

To strike out from Section 1, Article VI, third line, the words "National Committee" and substitute "referendum vote."

To strike out from Section 1, Article VI, the last sentence and substitute the following:

The names of candidates shall be placed on the ballot in alphabetical arrangement.

The member voting shall designate his first choice by writing the figure "1" opposite the name of his first choice; his second choice by writing the figure "2" opposite the name of his second choice; his third choice by writing the figure "3" opposite the name of his third choice, indicating his relative preference for each and every candidate named upon the ballot by different and consecutive numbers. Any ballot not made in exact compliance with the aforesaid rules shall be void.

The several National Executive Committeemen shall each be indicated by a different number, and the member placing in nomination a candidate shall indicate by number for which of the specific offices the nomination is made.

Ballotting for each National Executive Committeeman shall be done as if they were different or dissimilar offices.

The candidate indicated by the lowest sum total of numbers opposite his name upon the ballot shall be elected.

Vacancies shall be filled in similar manner.

Members of the National Committee may be recalled by referendum vote.

The initiative for recall shall not be

held open but shall be sent out immediately.

DEL. GAYLORD: The next section is Article VII, which reads as follows:

Section 1: The National Secretary shall be elected by the National Committee, and shall hold office for two years. The call for nominations and election shall be conducted at the same time and in the same manner as that of the National Executive Committee. Vacancies shall be filled in a similar manner. The National Secretary shall receive as compensation the sum of Fifteen Hundred Dollars annually, and shall give a bond in a sum fixed by the National Executive Committee."

There is a substitute offered by the minority, Comrades Snyder, Lipscomb and Bell, as follows:

"The National Secretary shall be elected or recalled in the same manner as are the National Executive Committeemen, and vacancies filled in the same manner."

DEL. STARKWEATHER (Cal.): I move to amend by adding the words: "The Secretary shall be subject to recall by national referendum."

DEL. WAGENKNECHT (Wash.): The National Secretary is always subject to recall. You can always recall a National Committeeman by referendum, because a certain number can always call for a referendum vote on any party matter.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair will rule unless it is otherwise insisted upon that this clause also falls with the action on the report on the other section.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): I want to offer a substitute for the report of the majority, that the National Secretary shall be elected by a referendum vote of the party membership, the nominations and election to be held as under the present constitution.

SEVERAL DELEGATES: Second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: The subject before the house is the Article of the Constitution just read. Comrade Goebel has the floor.

DEL. GOEBEL: I have no desire to take your time, but even if I am the only man who votes that way, I shall vote against this majority report. I know of no finer scheme for building up a machine in the Socialist Party than we have here today, whatever may be the motives of the committee. One of

the things that you and I have pointed out on the platform is that under the capitalist rule you have a chance only once every two years to elect your governors and state officers, and legislators. What have we here? There are two radical changes. The membership is to have no voice directly in the election of the National Secretary, and then not satisfied with that, they propose that we shall have him appointed for two years instead of one. I protest against it. Just what we have had in the past we are to have again. I am a long time in this movement, and I know some of the history of the Socialist Labor Party, and I know what they ran up against from this same kind of organization, this closely centralized plan of organization. What puzzles me is that with all that history in your recollection you still vote for such articles as this. I tell you that I am going to vote to have the rank and file elect this National Secretary, and not twenty or thirty or even forty men.

A DELEGATE: I would like to know if the members of the National Committee were not always elected by referendum vote.

DEL. VANDER PORTEN: They were always elected by referendum vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is on the motion by the delegate from New Jersey. Those in favor will raise their hands and remain so till counted. Those opposed will do likewise.

DEL. KEARNS (N. J.): I desire to be recorded as voting for this resolution.

THE CHAIRMAN: The vote is in favor of the motion 55; opposed 62. The motion is lost.

DEL. RIGG (Idaho): I move that when this is submitted to referendum vote the substitute be submitted with it, and the matter will then be tested.

The motion was duly seconded.

DEL. OSBORNE (Cal.): I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion was duly seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: A motion was made by Comrade Rigg that the substitute and the committee's report be printed and sent to the referendum as an alternative. The motion was made and seconded to lay that motion on the table. A division is called for.

DEL. THOMPSON (Wis.): I should like to ask whether it is not true that

all of this constitution by its provisions must go to the referendum.

DELEGATES: Sure!

THE CHAIRMAN: Those in favor of the motion to lay on the table will raise their hands. Those opposed. The chair will say that when the constitution is sent to referendum each member will have the opportunity to compare it with the present constitution, and they will compare it before they vote.

The motion to lay on the table was declared carried by a vote of 61 for and 52 against.

A DELEGATE: A point of information. If any part of this proposed constitution is defeated on the referendum would the old constitution stand?

DELEGATES: Sure. Certainly.

It was decided that a defeated amendment could not be submitted to referendum.

Adjourned until 9 a. m., May 17.

EIGHTH DAY'S SESSION

According to the adjournment the previous day the convention was to have met at 9 o'clock, but it was considerably later when Del. Gaylord called the convention to order and called for nominations for Chairman of the day.

Del. Thompson, of Wisconsin, was elected Chairman for the day.

National Secretary Barnes was by common consent declared elected temporary secretary in the absence of Secretary Heath.

FRATERNAL DELEGATES FROM CANADA.

The fraternal delegates from Canada were offered the floor.

DEL. A. W. MANCE (fraternal delegate from Canada): Comrades and friends, a good many of you know that I was from Canada originally, and after I got through with my work here in Chicago on the Weekly Socialist, I went home for a while to see my mother, and she treated me so well that I have been there ever since. When I got to Toronto I thought I would not look at a Socialist or see one for at least a couple of months, because I wanted rest. I thought I wanted to get away from them. But I got there Wednesday, and on Saturday night I was on the corner talking Socialism in Toronto (Applause), and I got just as busy there as I was here. So it is the same spirit that dominates a man, no matter what part of the world he gets in.

If you imagine, any of you, that you can get away from Socialism, you will have to travel farther into the woods than I have. I have traveled through Canada, and I have been away up in the North. Our movement there is very similar to what it is here. Conditions there are very similar to what they are here, except we are having or did have until last fall a particularly active land movement. The last of the great West is now being opened up in western Canada. What was known as the American

frontier for more than a hundred years and had been rolling west has now started to roll north, and there is a great, tremendous territory opening up. But I am glad to tell you that within a week after the first settler goes anywhere in a new community there is some kind of a Socialist document reaches him. I have been away up where the last settler appeared to be in the northern country, and there I would either find the Appeal to Reason or Wilshire's Magazine or some other Socialist paper or pamphlet. (Applause.) The conditions there are very similar to what they are here. It is only an imaginary line that divides us. We speak the same language, we wear the same kind of clothes, and we know no difference between the laws of capitalism there and here. There is merely a difference in name so far as the governments are concerned.

While you have been watching parades of the unemployed of the United States in your cities, we in Toronto also had an unemployed problem, and I wish to tell you that when the unemployed, who numbered hundreds, thousands, yes, probably ten thousand, needed some one to speak for them the only ones who would hire a hall and lead them down and talk to the authorities were the Socialist local of Toronto. (Applause.) We paid the hall rent for three days, talked Socialism to them, and then we took them down to the city hall and told the mayor the condition the people were in, and made speeches from the city hall steps. The council authorities there have a little more sense than they have here. We sent them word that we were coming and that we would be down there perhaps a thousand strong at a certain time on a certain morning. They did not get the police force to mob us or do anything else. We gathered in front of the city hall two thousand strong. We arranged to have our

marshals march them down straight, almost like an army, and from the time we left the meeting hall until we got to the city hall steps was the first time we saw a policeman anywhere. Then they told us to spread out, that the mayor was ready to receive us. There were whole portions of the city of Toronto that had to be fed by charity, just the same as you have here. Despite the fact that we have millions of acres of land and factories that can more than supply everything that the desire of a human being can ask for, there is poverty there the same as here.

The immigration problem is just beginning to reach them, and there is where our Socialist philosophers are running up against practical facts and coming into clash there the same as they do here. There is an attempt in British Columbia on the part of the white race to keep the Japanese from overcoming them. As you know, we are building about 12,000 miles of new railroad through that country in the western and southwestern provinces. In British Columbia there are about 125,000 white men, and had the business men succeeded in the attempt to bring the coolies and Japs in there they would simply have had a rebellion on their hands in the British empire to keep them out. Those are the facts. I am not here to discuss the fine points in our philosophy, but there are the facts, and I am satisfied that that is one of the great problems that will bring the working class of Canada, in the West at least, and those in the United States into line. Now, I believe in the Socialist philosophy, which says, "Workingmen of all countries, unite," but there is the fact, and inside of five years the white race in the western provinces of Canada will absolutely have a struggle to keep the Japanese and Chinese from overrunning the field. The problem there is just the same as here, exactly.

Just one more point about our movement over there. It is young, healthy and strong. It is revolutionary, what there is of it. We have a large number of dues-paying members in Toronto. We have five locals of different languages, Finnish, Jewish, English, French and Italian. We have over 400 of our Finnish comrades there, and they are the same as they are everywhere. In a population of 400 Finns there are 120 dues-paying Finnish comrades, and they

have built a hall of their own that cost them \$12,000. They have got a band and a little theater and almost everything you could desire, and they are just like their people everywhere, ready for Socialism, waiting for the rest of the workingmen to get ready. (Applause.)

In British Columbia our comrades have succeeded in sending three members to the legislature, and our comrades from the West will bear me out that they are capable of holding up the banner of Socialism and the red flag of liberty in that legislature. Although they call themselves impossibilists, they are the kind of impossibilists that I like, although I do not generally come under that head. (Applause.) They watch everything that comes up, and they are looking after the interests of the working class.

Our movement there is healthy, strong and revolutionary. It is just what a young movement ought to be, with a membership who really understand the principles of Socialism, and we will yet see the time when the movement over there will probably grow as fast as anywhere else in the world. It appears that we have got economic conditions alike, just about the same the world over. Immigrants are rolling in, last year 300,000 of them.

With one incident I will close. We have got about 30,000 immigrants in Toronto alone. They had a big preachers' meeting the other day in Toronto, and a very famous preacher there, a doctor, made a very impassioned speech on the immigration question. He showed that at the rate the immigrants were arriving it was only a question of time until they would swamp the English population, because when you take into account that two millions of them are French in the province of Quebec and that they are in about the same condition now that they were two hundred years ago in France when their ancestors immigrated out there, they naturally got frightened. He said that every tenth man, I think it was, or fifteenth man, that you meet today is an immigrant in the city of Toronto; every twentieth man that you meet in the Dominion of Canada is an immigrant. They came last year in great numbers, and there was a tremendous problem, and Dr. Wilson held up his hands in holy horror of the future. A few weeks afterward in the hall which the city

council owns and gave us free of rent to hold our May Day celebration we had 1,200 of these people gathered in that hall. There were the Italians, the Poles, the Jews, the Irish, and people of almost all nationalities. I stood before that audience that night to make an address for the international Socialist Party, and I referred to Dr. Wilson's address and his fear and horror of these foreigners, and I said, "Doctor, don't worry; as I look out over this audience I see a proof of one of the grand principles of Socialism, the brotherhood of man. Doctor, we will take care of them." (Applause.)

DEL. J. E. DRURY (fraternal delegate from Canada): I have just come over here to present greetings to you from Canada. The fact is that no matter where you go you always meet Socialists. We have just come over here to see how you run your business here and to see if we can learn anything. Possibly we can learn a little, if we cannot learn much. I think we are certainly helping the American Socialist movement, and maybe after the next election we will return one or two of our members from Ontario to the legislature. (Applause.)

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTION RESUMED.

THE CHAIRMAN: The business pending is Article VII, Section 1.

DEL. GAYLORD: I understand it was fully discussed, and it only remains for the convention to say whether or not it will adopt the report of the committee on this section:

"Section 1. The National Secretary shall be elected by the National Committee and shall hold office for two years. The call for nominations and election shall be conducted at the same time and in the same manner as that of the National Executive Committee. Vacancies shall be filled in the same manner. The National Secretary shall receive as compensation the sum of fifteen hundred dollars annually and shall give a bond in a sum fixed by the National Executive Committee."

DEL. COWAN (Ohio): I move its adoption. (Seconded.)

DEL. OSBORNE (Cal.): I would like to make an amendment. The amendment offered is where it reads that the National Secretary shall hold

office for two years. I would make an amendment this way: "Shall be elected by the National Committee and hold office at the will of the National Committee," instead of two years. (Seconded.)

DEL. FIELDMAN: If you want to kill the majority report, or rather the report of the committee, you cannot kill it any more effectively than by just placing in it this expression "at will." I do not say that Comrade Osborne intended it so, but if he did he could not devise a better method of having this thing killed, for the comrades in the Socialist party will never stand for the election of any officer to hold office at the will of any committee, that is to say, to hold it just as long as that committee sees fit. (Applause.) I therefore hope, comrades, that you will understand, if not the purpose, the real effect of this, and that you will vote it down. Let the National Committee be commanded by the Socialist Party of this country; that the National Secretary be elected for two years, and after that two years we will elect either the same one or a new National Secretary. That is the sensible thing, and that is consequently the proper thing to do.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

(Question called for.) All those in favor say aye. Opposed, no. The noes have it; the amendment is defeated. Proceed.

DEL. BERLYN (Ill.): Let us pass the article.

The article as reported was again read, and on motion was adopted.

Delegates Devine, of Ohio, and Stinton, of Michigan, asked to be recorded as favoring the election of National Secretary by referendum vote of the membership.

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): A point of information. The section just adopted provided that a bond be given by the Secretary. I would like to ask the Committee on Constitution if they have considered who is to hold that bond.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will the committee answer?

DEL. MORGAN: Who is to hold that bond? Who could sue on that bond if the Secretary violated any of his financial obligations? There are a lot of lawyers here. I want to find out what provision has been made to secure the funds of the party, whether they are

secure now, or whether they will be secured by the giving of that bond.

DEL. GAYLORD: I will ask Comrade Slobodin to answer.

DEL. SLOBODIN: The committee does not believe that the party can sue on the bond. Naturally it will be the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party most likely. If there are trustees, then the bond is to go to the trustees, and they will be the ones to sue, or whoever the National Committee may determine.

DEL. MORGAN: I want to know if the committee has considered the fact that under the constitution as it now stands it now gives no protection absolutely to the funds of the party, and if Comrade Barnes should die today his heirs would have absolute control of every dollar that is in his possession, and there is nobody in the party, under the present constitution or under that constitution, that has a right to sue for any piece of property that is held by the party. I simply ask for information. I ask the committee, before it finishes its report, to frame a section to go with that, or if you can tell us how we are satisfied that every dollar paid in by our members is secured by the proper officer under that constitution.

DEL. BERLYN (Ill.): We never had in the constitution a clause for a bond. Now, I suggest that we have a clause providing for a bond. The reason is this, that in the report of the Executive Committee I notice a statement as to the manner of the disposal of the money. It was decided by the Executive Committee that the National Secretary deposit the funds in the name of the Socialist party. Now there is established some control. You cannot have a constitution with every point involved. We are generous, but experience should teach us wisdom. I have got perfect faith in Comrade Barnes, but it is the possibility that I want to protect the party against, and I believe that the Executive Committee or those whom we trust with the charge of the property will create such safeguards as are necessary and as experience teaches us from time to time. We are wasting time. We ought to get through by dinner time and go home.

DEL. GAYLORD: Let me suggest that Comrade Morgan frame this at this time, as we are out of order technically and if he will frame his conception of

how it should be drafted, whether it should embody a provision specifically providing for the details, we can introduce this under a motion to adopt as a whole, when it will be perfectly in order and get it as Comrade Morgan wants it.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection that suggestion will be accepted and we will proceed.

The remaining sections of Article VII, Sections 2, 3 and 4, were then read, with the explanation that they were identical with those in the old constitution. The sections are as follows:

"Section 2. The National Secretary shall have charge of all affairs of the National office subject to the directions of the Executive Committee and the National Committee. He shall receive the reports of the state organizations and of the local organizations in unorganized states and territories. He shall supervise the accounts of the national office, and the work of the lecture bureau, the literature bureau, and such other departments as may hereafter be established in connection with the National office."

"Section 3. The National Secretary shall issue to all party organizations, in such way as the Executive Committee may direct, monthly bulletins containing a report of the financial affairs of the party, a summary of the conditions and the membership of the several state and territorial organizations, the principal business transacted by his office and such other matters pertaining to the organization and activity of the party as may be of general interest to the membership. Such bulletins shall not contain editorial comment."

"Section 4. The National Secretary shall be empowered to secure such help as may be necessary for the proper transaction of the business of his office."

The three sections were adopted without objection or discussion.

DEL. WORK (Iowa): I want to move an additional section, to be known as Section 5.

"Section 5. The National Secretary may be recalled at any time by the National Committee or the membership."

The amendment was seconded and adopted without discussion.

DEL. GAYLORD: In Article VIII the committee makes only one sugges-

tion for a change in Section 2. It read formerly: "The lecture bureau shall have no connection with the work of organization, and it shall have the right to make arrangements for the lecturers under its auspices with all state or local organizations of the party." We make this suggestion: Strike out the phrase "shall have no connection with the work of organization." That seemed to us to be nonsensical, because the work of the lecture bureau almost unavoidably has connection with the work of organization in new fields, and we want it to be so. On the other hand, we strike out the phrase "shall have the right to make arrangements with all local organizations," and make it "shall have the right to make arrangements with all state organizations." That means this, that if the National Secretary makes arrangements through the state organizations to route speakers through the local organizations it is satisfactory and according to the constitution, but where the state secretaries prefer that such routing be through the state office entirely, then the constitution can permit it to be done in that manner. It removes the possibility of friction and misunderstanding. Now, in the first section there is no change as to the lecture bureau.

The first section is as follows:

"Section 1. There shall be maintained in connection with the National office a lecture bureau for the purpose of arranging tours for lecturers for the propaganda of Socialism."

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the suggestion of the committee.

On motion the section was adopted without discussion.

The next section was read.

"Section 2. The lecture bureau shall have the right to make arrangements for the lecturers under its auspices with all state organizations of the party."

Adopted without objection.

The next section was read.

"Section 3. The National Committee shall establish a uniform rate of compensation for all lecturers and organizers working under its auspices."

Adopted without debate.
Article IX was read.

"Section 1. The National Committee shall also maintain in the headquarters of the party a department for

the dissemination of Socialist literature."

"Section 2. The Literature Bureau shall keep for sale to the local organizations of the party and others, a stock of Socialist books, pamphlets and other literature, and shall have the right, with the approval of the committee, to publish works on Socialism or for the purpose of Socialist propaganda, but this clause shall not be construed as authorizing the bureau to publish any periodical."

"Section 3. The profits of the Literature Bureau shall go into the general funds of the party treasury." The article was adopted without objection.

DEL. GAYLORD: To facilitate discussion, and I know discussion will arise, I wish to say that the first sentence in Article X, is the same as the former Section 1 of "Conventions," and I will read it.

"Section 1. The regular National Convention of the party shall be held in all years in which elections for President and Vice President of the United States are to be held."

There is no question on that, I believe.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any objections? It is adopted.

DEL. GAYLORD: As to the second sentence under "Conventions," for the purpose of facilitating the discussion, not having had a chance to confer with the committee and learn the opinion of the committee, I wish to make this a separate section.

"Section (). A convention composed of National Committeemen, State Secretaries of various states and editors of Socialist newspapers designated by the National Committee shall be held in all even numbered years when no regular convention is held, to consider and report recommendations upon the program, agitation and organization of the party."

I wish to say that I have added there what was definitely understood in the committee, but did not get into print. A question has been raised, but Del. Slayton will confirm me when I say that it was definitely understood in the committee that this was to be to consider and report recommendations upon program, agitation and organization of the party. May I speak just a moment on

that? I move the adoption. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that this section be adopted. The comrade has asked for the floor.

DEL. GAYLORD: I think I can save time. I know you want to make amendments, and I want to open the door for them. We did not have time in the convention for proper consideration. One of the most important things that the organization has done was when it was moved here to put this over till 9 o'clock in the morning, and we do not know that we can do anything for four years unless we adopt this. There are important things that come up. We have not had a chance to get together and properly develop our ideas on agitation and organization. We need this opportunity. Now, how shall we secure this opportunity in the simplest way? I am not absolutely sure it is the best way, but we have wanted something, and we formulated it this way. If you can find a better way, very well, but we felt the necessity of that, and the happenings in this convention have proved it.

DEL. SLAYTON: I want to suggest to Comrade Gaylord a point that other speakers may take into consideration. You say to consider and recommend, or consider and adopt. What do they want to recommend? To whom will they recommend? To the National Committee. Therefore, instead of recommending I move that it be to adopt measures. I move that as an amendment.

DEL. SPARGO: There is one phrase in the clause as read as to this extra convention, this new form of convention, to which I take very decided objection. This committee has, I see, provided that this convention shall consist of National Committeemen, National Executive Committeemen, State Secretaries and editors of papers designated by the National Committee. In that sentence I think we are laying up a store of trouble for the party if we adopt it, unless we make it that any editor of a Socialist paper can attend and take part, or leave it to a vote of the membership. If we place on the National Committee the responsibility of saying that only certain papers shall be represented, then there will inevitably arise, as I can see, jealousy between

papers, and the papers not represented will want to carry on a fight, and it seems to me we could not devise a better plan to create friction than by just that thing, and I move as an amendment that those words "and editors of party papers designated by the National Committee" be stricken out. (Seconded.)

DEL. HAZLETT (Mont.): I think it is of the utmost importance that the editors of Socialist party papers should attend. Now I do not understand that you shall have those that are owned by the state organization or the city or local or county organization, but that all those papers which are recognized as representing the Socialist party should be represented, and it seems to me that we are never going to put the American party on any correct basis of understanding our position until we fortify the press of the American Socialist party. Our press is a disgrace. We only have a few that are not private papers that are more or less charged with a desire to graft on this movement. We are not building up a local press that will fight the capitalists in our home towns and in different sections of the country. Our money is being paid into certain papers far off. Now, it seems to me if we are ever to have a press representing us in our local fights with the capitalist class we have got to build up a united party press. It seems to me in this conference I cannot see how it would in any way cause dispute if all the editors or representatives of all the party papers were asked to come to this conference. I should not be in favor of having only certain ones have the right to represent the Socialist party, but I would like to have all the editors of the party papers. There isn't any paper I know of except the party paper in Montana, the Montana News, and the Social Democratic Herald, that are representative organs of the party. It is of the utmost importance to have good financial local support for these papers. The papers that go all over the country and take part in every Socialist conference, you don't have to go to their financial support. So I would wish to have included with the editors of the party press the business managers also.

DEL. C. L. FURMAN (N. Y.): I would like to ask if these editors will have only a voice and no vote, or whether they will have a voice and vote with the committee.

DEL. MAY WOOD SIMONS (Ill.): I understand this proposition is to the effect that the results of the meeting or conference or convention shall go out to the party for a referendum. I simply want to make an amendment. Is the motion or the amendment now before the house?

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment is now before us, made by Comrade Spargo.

DEL. MAY WOOD SIMONS: Then I wish to amend this in this form: that the editors of the papers and the business managers shall be included in the conferences, without a vote, but that they shall have the right to take part in the conferences. It seems to me this is absolutely essential. No one needs educating any more than the editors of our papers (laughter and applause), and it is absolutely necessary that we should come in close contact with the organizers and with those who are mentioned in this to take part in the conference. Therefore, I believe this form would be entirely satisfactory to the party if they are given the benefit of the discussion, but are not allowed to vote. We understand that these editors are not elected by the party, that is, the majority of them are not. Therefore, they should not have a vote in the conference, because the matter is to go out before the party in a referendum. (Applause.)

Amendment seconded.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): Comrade Chairman and comrades, I agree with Comrade Simons that there is no one who needs education more than the editor. Not only that, but the editor is the one most apt to learn, as a rule. If he does not learn he will soon cease to be an editor. I can say this from experience; I have had many years experience in editing papers, both dailies and weeklies, and I can say this from experience that I have had in editing a daily that went down and editing weeklies also that came nearer being an absolute success in every way, that is even financially, without having a gold mine to back it, than any other Socialist paper in the country. While we have no surplus, we come near to paying our running expenses. In other words, I mean the Social Democratic Herald. A year ago it had a monthly deficit of four dollars. That is very little for a Socialist paper, of course. But, of course, that is not the idea. I do not know of

any editor who wants to come here to dictate to anybody. If the editors want to dictate they find other means than to push themselves upon any convention in their capacity as editors. An editor can usually manage to be elected a delegate, let me tell you. I have always heard that. Just look at Comrade Lee; how often has he been a delegate, or Simons, or Berger? Don't you forget it, we could become delegates if we want to. That is not the idea. It is not that Socialist editors would want to push themselves upon any convention as delegates.

As I understand the idea of these conferences, and I have talked the matter over with some of our friends, it is that this is the only country I know of and the only convention of Socialist parties where there is so little real theoretical, real scientific theoretical discussion going on. When an editor delegate gets up and talks, what he says and what he thinks is scientific, it is usually repeating the cheap phrases he had learned from some five-cent pamphlet, and that is the beginning and the end of all his phrases. There is a deplorable lack of any good, real discussion from the Socialist scientific standpoint, from the real scientific standpoint in the use of a few phrases about clear-cutness and class consciousness and uncompromisedness and a good deal other nonsense. Not only do they use a few hollow words, but let me tell you that is not science. A man has to be able to talk about any subject, and we do usually to some extent in Milwaukee. We take up anything, whether it is a new pavement, whether it is some other subject that is before us, and treat it from a Socialist standpoint.

Now, you can take up any subject; you can take up history and treat it from the Socialist standpoint. I understand these conferences are in off years when we do not have any ticket to nominate and no platform to make a fight about, as to whether these amendments are scientific or not. As I say, they are to be when we have the peace of mind to sit down and take up the questions before the people and treat them in a scientific manner from a theoretical Socialist standpoint, and then you will see that our other conventions will have a higher standard and a higher level. That is what I understand the conference is to be for, and there is where

we need the editors and need them very badly.

A DELEGATE: We must have them.

DEL. BERGER: Now, it is entirely superfluous or really of little consequence whether you have a voice and vote or not. It does not make any difference, because they are not making a new constitution, they are not changing your platform; they are simply to express their opinions on certain subjects before the people. If you don't want me there as editor, then I will be elected the same as the others.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me suggest that we have the amendment offered by Del. Simons before us, and, if you can, dispose of that. I notice they are discussing the main question.

DEL. KONIKOW (Mass.): I would like to know if Comrade Simons' amendment contains the words "designated by the National Committee."

THE CHAIRMAN: No, I think not.

DEL. GAYLORD: Did you intend to have editors designated by the National Committee, Comrade Simons, or all Socialist editors?

DEL. M. W. SIMONS: All Socialist editors.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will fix it so as to include all Socialist editors.

DEL. JOSEPHINE R. COLE (Cal.): I would like to ask how you are going to designate those Socialist editors.

THE CHAIRMAN: I cannot answer that question.

DEL. WORK (Iowa): I want to ask whether it is the intention of the committee that this conference shall have power to bind the party in any way.

DEL. GAYLORD: The report as changed and approved by the members of the committee gives this conference authority to consider and report recommendations upon program, agitation and organization of the party.

DEL. WORK: And not to bind the party?

DEL. GAYLORD: Not to bind the party. The recommendations would have to go out in the form of a referendum and be adopted before they would bind the party.

DEL. POPE (Mo.): I am in favor of this, but I want to move, if it is in order at this time, a substitute for the whole, and then I want to give the purpose of it. I move as a substitute the

following: "A convention composed of members elected by referendum vote shall be held in all even numbered years when no regular convention is held, for the purpose of"—and then adding that.

DEL. GAYLORD: Striking out the other?

DEL. POPE: Yes, and if I get a second I will speak to it. (Substitute seconded.) This is my point: You know and I know that there is not an editor in the Socialist movement but what will be sent here on a referendum vote of this party. And what do we want? We want to have the editors, the best minds in our conventions, and we want the conventions held by those who know just what to do. I want the brains of the Socialist Party sent to the conventions if possible, and that is the reason why I moved the substitute.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): Comrade Berger and some people have got a notion that the referendum vote is a garbage barrel for all discarded notions and ideas. Therefore they do not understand those who want to refer to a referendum vote. Now, the constitution provides that the National Committee may meet whenever it deems necessary to do so. It is an expense, but it is a necessity at the same time for the National Committee to meet anyhow. Now you have heard it frequently said that it would be good for the movement if the state secretaries of all the states would meet in a conference. It would be, indeed, but it involves an expense. You have heard it frequently said that it would be well for the movement to have the editors of Socialist papers hold conferences. No question about it, it would be well, but it would involve expense. All these conferences will take place within the next four years, and this obviates the necessity of this sort of an independent conference, and it also will obviate the necessity of calling special conventions; that is, it may obviate the necessity for this sort of a convention. What is the true power, the true influence of this conference, according to the recommendation of the committee? To adopt and recommend, that is all. To recommend does not mean that they have the power to

submit to a referendum. After they recommend what shall be done? The National Committee will submit that by correspondence to see whether the membership will reject or adopt the recommendation. These recommendations will have no more than moral force. At the same time they are valuable for the purpose of education, as far as that is concerned. I say, if we create this convention or create this conference, let us make a success of it. There cannot be so many editors at that time of Socialist newspapers that they will outvote the conference, and I think the editors may be entrusted with a vote. Take the editors of education, and especially the editors of the great Socialist papers in this country, the reason why they are so independent of the party is because they are not represented in the councils of the party. I at one time thought that a certain editor, a well-respected comrade in the West, the editor of a newspaper that you all know here—I thought at one time, but I was mistaken, that he was dangerous to the movement. Now, I think he should be included, even if he once advocated some of the cheap phrases of Hearst. I would admit him to the councils of the party, because I know that if you place every honest man in a responsible position he becomes conservative. By all means let Wayland go to these conferences. By all means let Wilshire have equal powers, and I tell you they will hold themselves more responsible to the party than they do now. That is the reason why I want to have them in the councils of the party. I say by all means let us have them. It is merely a trial, after all. I do not say it will turn out a success. It may make trouble, but let us have a trial of this conference, though it amounts to almost nothing. We may not endorse the recommendations after they are adopted.

DEL. TUTTLE (Wis.): A point of order. Every one that has talked has been talking for one side. Give somebody a chance to say something on the other side. I want to say something on the other side.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): I am on the other side because I am not satisfied either with what the committee

has done or with the substitute. If I have any one hobby and have had ever since within one year of my being national organizer, it has been this question of methods, better ways of doing things. I say there is something wrong. I have said it all over the country, and this very proposition continues the wrong. You have got, for example, a number of men on the road as national organizers. You have absolutely no way at present by which you can get the benefit of those men's experience, by which those men can be brought in touch with other workers in the movement and teach the others what has been taught to them. It is only in this way that able men come to be recognized and put in the place they are fitted for. If I had my way we would not call this a convention, because the moment you call it a convention you mix it up. I would call it a conference. I would have certain people elected and sent to that conference whose expenses would be paid, and who would not have only a voice but a vote in that conference. I would also allow anybody that wanted to come to that conference to come and have a voice but not a vote, and pay their own expenses. The result would be what? We would gather together, in my judgment, the ablest men we have got in any line. I say that today the crying need of the Socialist party is better methods of work. We have, for example, I think I may freely say, no money. Time and time again I have said it, that it is not a question of money; it is a question of methods and I will prove it to you, just as other organizers have said. Now, it is simply a question of getting these people together. If I had my way we would call it a conference and not a convention. We would provide to have sent to the conference at the expense of the national organization the National Committee-men, secretaries and the editors of papers, but no one else to have expenses paid. The national organizers, I would include them. It may seem personal, but I would include them, because they are the men that are coming in touch with the movement and know not only the conditions in the big cities, but in the little cities,

and the difficulties that the outlying local is up against as well as the big city local. I would bring these men together and pay their expenses, and have a regular set program for certain days. I would have that conference last at least one week. I would have a time fixed at which that conference was to sit. I would have a time fixed with a definite program. One day I would have a lecture on the party press, as to the management of that party press, as to the editorship, as to the style of articles that were desired, as to the best methods of circulating those papers and advancing them in the neighborhood. I would have questions of organization. In other words, I would learn from the prohibitionist, I would learn from the church, I would learn from every other organization every one of the ideas and tricks and methods that have given them a hundred times the power and influence that they would have had if it had not been for those methods. I am not satisfied with either article, and that is the reason I am opposing it.

DEL. SOLOMON (N. Y.): I am opposed to all the amendments, and I am in favor of the substitute motion of Comrade Pope of Missouri. I believe the recommendation of the committee and the amendment practically means a national convention by appointment, and means that people ought to be sent there, not in view of their merits, but because they happen to hold a certain position in the party. It has been intimated here that a conference of various editors will have no effective value; in other words, they will not be able to carry out their decisions immediately, but they will go to a referendum vote. Now, let us consider, if there is a convention in which all the editors of the papers, all the state secretaries and members of the National Committee decide certain things and have them submitted to a referendum vote, I want to ask you, what chance have you got to vote down a proposition of that kind. Here you have got all the editors on one side, you have got all the state secretaries on the other side, and they will all want to carry anything that this convention or conference may decide. I say if it is nec-

sary to have a special convention for the purpose of deciding theoretical questions, let us have a convention elected by a referendum vote of the membership of the party and not by appointment, which probably means delegates to a convention just to consider special matters. I say a comrade who happens to be a state secretary may be a very efficient man in his own work and may be a very efficient man in clerical work, and yet may not be an efficient man to be sent to a national convention. I say if you want to have or to hold a national convention, let it be of members elected by the membership and not by appointment.

DEL. LEE (N. Y.): I would like to ask for another reading of Del. Pope's substitute so as to make sure about some phrases in it.

Del. Reilly read as follows: Pope's substitute is that a convention composed of members elected by referendum vote shall be held in all even-numbered years when no regular convention is to be held, to consider and report recommendations upon program, agitation and organization of the party.

DEL. LEE: I regret that I did not get the floor before Comrade Pope, because I have a substitute for the whole that is much shorter as well as simple, but of course it is out of order now. I wanted to move simply that a regular national convention of the party be held in every even-numbered year. This would effect all the purposes which you are trying to effect by the proposition of the committee, by the two amendments and by the substitute. It would effect it and at the same time entirely obviate the objection to having a convention or conference or whatever you call it that is at least partly appointive instead of representative. It would not involve materially greater expense, and perhaps not greater expense than the conference that you propose in the committee arrangement. It would not prevent the holding of conferences of Socialist editors, organizers and so forth, because as a matter of fact most of the editors and organizers and state secretaries do often serve in our ordinary conventions as delegates, but they are elected

because they are considered to be qualified as delegates. All this would command greater respect from the party membership than any irregular or special conference of the sort contemplated by the committee report and by the amendments, and it would have yet another advantage over those and over the special sort of convention contemplated in Comrade Pope's substitute for the whole. I do not see any reason, in the first place, I say, why we should have this sort of semi-official conference instead of a convention. And if we can have a convention elected by a referendum vote just in the same way that our nominating convention is elected as Comrade Pope suggests; if we give them any power, shall that convention have power only to consider and recommend, while a convention held in the presidential year is supposed to have power to act just as it has at the present time? Now, comrades, the shortest and most effective way to go about it is just the short, straight line. We know—and I have no doubt this has influenced the minds of the members of the committee—we know that the parties in the various countries of Europe, as a rule, hold their conventions annually, and we know it has a very good effect on the party if they do hold their conventions annually. This country is so large and holding conventions so expensive that it is impracticable or has been for us to hold our conventions annually. I do believe, however, that we are reaching the point where it would be quite practicable for us to hold regular conventions bi-ennially at least, and if it should be necessary make those conventions somewhat smaller; make the basis of representation one for 500 instead of one for 400, or whatever it happens to be; make the basis somewhat smaller. That would be better than to go on only once in four years and rush through our work in some respects very badly, as we are doing it at this time. I would like to have had an opportunity to introduce my substitute for the whole, which would provide simply that a regular national convention of the party be held in every even-numbered year.

DEL. POPE: If I get my second

to consent I will take that suggestion and let it be the substitute.

DEL. LEE: I thank you. I wanted to do it awhile ago.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection? If there is no objection, then with the common consent Comrade Lee's suggestion will now become a motion as a substitute for the whole.

A DELEGATE: A point of order. This does away or conflicts with section 1, Article X, which states that we shall hold a convention every four years.

THE CHAIRMAN: Technically that is true, but at the same time it would not be fair to rule on it.

THE DELEGATE: That can be obviated by calling it a nominating convention.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will not sustain that point, because we may change that later if we wish to.

DEL. JOHNS (Cal.): I am afraid I shall have to speak in favor of Comrade Lee's substitute, though it is with great regret that I do so. It is not nearly so interesting as the form that was developing for the conference which we would have if things had gone on a little farther. The things are getting very close to me. I thought I was to be included in the regular form eventually. I thought the state and county organizers and secretaries would certainly be included and that I should not have to start a Socialist newspaper a month before this convention began. (Laughter.) As it is, that is rendered unnecessary, and I shall have to take my chances probably with the others of being elected. In fact, I think in spite of some disadvantages to some organizers and Socialist editors and so forth, it is after all the best way to let those come to that convention whom the membership actually want, instead of, of course, the ones that they should have. (Laughter.)

DEL. GOEBEL: May I ask a question?

THE CHAIRMAN: If he consents.

DEL. GOEBEL: I would like to ask the comrade to tell me when it has been possible for the state secretaries and organizers to get together

even for four hours during this convention for a conference?

DEL. JOHNS: Well, I don't think that there would be any greater probability of their getting together as secretaries or organizers, Comrade Goebel, if the choice of the membership for delegates to the convention were excluded by the form. I think it is up to them in the convention whether they should get together or not. If they don't come here it is probably because the membership don't care to have them come here. Of course, the desirability of having the organization that the membership should have is great, but it should be remembered that in the end the only results of any value in the movement itself will be gained and determined by the intelligence of the membership as a whole, and that the membership must get right before anything can be accomplished, and they can get right only through practice in making mistakes. Therefore, in spite of the loss of interest in this conference, I am in favor of Comrade Lee's substitute.

DEL. CARR (Ill.): I rise to support the substitute offered by Comrade Lee and accepted by the others, for several reasons. In the first place, I believe that the Socialist party rank and file is quite competent to decide upon the ones that it wishes to attend this conference or convention, and I am becoming very tired of hearing the cheap demagoguery that is used constantly in democratic and republican arguments against popular rule, against direct legislation and against the referendum, when used in a Socialist convention. (Applause.) Whenever a member of that very select company, referred to in terms of pink tea by the comrade from the West, gets up to speak on any matter that seems to concern his chances or the chances of his clique to rule the Socialist Party, he begins to assault one of the main principles of Socialism, direct legislation. Without direct legislation Socialism itself would be impossible, and without direct legislation the proper management of the Socialist Party would be impossible. I have taken pride in a great many states of this union and in a great many cities and country villages of this country, in saying that the So-

cialist Party stands for direct legislation and practices it by running its party on the referendum plan (applause), and I should be very sorry to have to go before these comrades again and apologize in having to explain that it has ceased to be so democratic as it was before. I am in favor of this convention coming in this year between the national campaigns, because I believe the result of this convention will be of advantage to the party. The educational influence and the unifying influence of this convention, and especially of this biennial convention, will be worth a hundred times more to the party than it costs. (Applause.) I believe with all my heart that if we had more of those conferences we would have not only a larger personal acquaintance, but it would be helpful. I am very happy to be able to agree with so many New York comrades in this matter of this referendum. I would like to suggest that it might be, if the comrades desire others besides those elected to come and have a voice in this convention, that another section might be added, and, if it is the will of this convention, to have these specified comrades come and have a voice in the national convention, and also Comrade Barnes. I would not object to that, but I do wish to insist with all my power, not only now but always, on a referendum of these matters to the party itself, and I do approve with all my heart this convention that is proposed.

DEL. SNYDER (Kan.): I move the previous question. (Seconded.)

DEL. GAYLORD: I wish to ask Comrade Lee whether he intends this section introduced by him and accepted by Comrade Pope will simply take the place of the entire section, including the portion already adopted under "Conventions." I so understand it.

DEL. LEE: I do so understand it.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the previous question shall now be put. All in favor—

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): A point of order. If you adopt this to take the place of what was adopted it would abolish the convention for the

nomination of president and vice president.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not know whether that is true or not. If it is, it is a serious point.

DEL. POPE: That is what I understood when I agreed to Comrade Lee's motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point of order is not sustained.

DEL. POPE: I want to present this question: When I accepted Comrade Lee's suggestion it was with this purpose; I had accepted it as a second section in that article. I did not mean to leave out the first clause there for a national convention which means to nominate. I did not mean that; I meant to accept it as a second part.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have been proceeding this morning by common consent and courtesy so as to get through, and we have got into confusion a little by doing it, but let us find out and get what we want. I will listen to Comrade Lee, because he is involved.

DEL. LEE: If Comrade Pope yielded to me with a certain understanding of the purport of my motion, I think in fairness I should not insist on my amendment in that form.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that is fair.

DEL. LEE: I suppose it will involve some editing of the words of the two sections, and for my part I am quite willing to entrust that to the constitution committee or whoever may have charge of the matter.

DEL. BERGER: A point of order. You cannot edit that one section. The editing must be done on the constitution as a whole.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your point is sustained.

DEL. BERGER: We cannot edit a part of the constitution. By adopting the last substitute we abolish the convention to nominate president and vice-president.

DEL. LEE: I mean distinctly editing for style.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point is sustained.

DEL. CARR: A question of information. Is it not true that if we accept this section as proposed by Comrades Pope and Lee it is only nec-

essary to reconsider the first section and put in the word "nominating"? That will save lots of time. Let us adopt it and get done.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT (Wash.): A point of order. A motion has been made and seconded for the previous question, and no more discussion is allowed.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point is not sustained. Comrade Hunt of Illinois has the floor.

DEL. PAULITSCH (N. Y.): I appeal from the decision.

DEL. HUNT: I yield the floor to Comrade Simons.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS (Ill.): I wish to ask the chair and the committee also, doesn't the substitute offered by Comrade Lee destroy the purpose for which the conference or convention is called? There are certain papers designated, according to this committee report, whose representatives are to attend this conference especially. If I understand his proposition, it was to the effect that they were to be elected or be delegates to the convention. The very men that the constitutional committee wish most to be in this conference would not then be present.

A DELEGATE: Wasn't it an educational conference that was intended?

THE CHAIRMAN: That is correct. Now, let us ask the secretary to read the proposition.

DEL. TUTTLE (Wis.): Mr. Chairman, not one time during this discussion has anyone said that if we don't vote in favor of the editors coming they could not come here and would not come. But they can come here and will come here. Then what is the use of all this discussion?

THE CHAIRMAN: The secretary will now read what is before us.

ASST. SEC. REILLY: There was first the report of the committee which Comrade Gaylord read, and which I would read if somebody had not taken my copy. The next was an amendment by Spargo of New York.

DEL. SPARGO: Since the purpose of the amendment has been served, with the consent of my second, might I withdraw that?

ASST. SEC. REILLY: All right. Then the next was a substitute by

Comrade Pope of Missouri, and afterwards that substitute was changed by Comrade Lee with the consent of Pope and as now changed reads that "A regular National Convention of the party shall be held in each even-numbered year."

DEL. POPE: Do you call that Section 2 of that article?

ASST. SEC. REILLY: I don't know what you would call it.

DEL. POPE: If that is what it is, we want to know it, because one contradicts the other.

ASST. SEC. REILLY: You will have to ask somebody else.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard what the secretary read. As I understand the motion now before us, the amendment is the one offered by Del. Pope, taken by Del. Lee, to the effect that a convention shall be called every two years. If we don't want that we can vote it down and start over again and get what we do want. Are you ready for the question? (Question called for.) All in favor of this as read by the secretary—

DEL. SLOBODIN: This is what? The amendment?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, the amendment offered by Comrade Pope. All in favor, say aye. Opposed, no. The noes seem to have it.

Division called for.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, understand what you are voting on. It is the motion offered by Comrade Pope of Missouri, understand, that you are voting on, which is this: To substitute for the report of the committee the following: "A regular national convention of the party shall be held in every even-numbered year." All those who are in favor of this raise your hands until the secretary has counted them. Opposed, raise your hands. The vote stands 61 for, 46 against. The motion is carried and the section is adopted. What is your further pleasure? The section as adopted reads, instead of the committee's report, as follows: "A regular national convention of the party shall be held in every even-numbered year." If that conflicts in any way with the other you want to bring in your motion now and straighten it out.

DEL. FARRELL (Ohio): I move

to reconsider the action taken in adopting the first part of that paragraph. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved to reconsider the action taken in adopting the first part of that recommendation.

DEL. FARRELL: And in connection with that, that it be **drafted** to correspond and be in harmony with that which we adopted; that is to say, to the extent that our national conventions be held every two years in even-numbered years.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded to reconsider the action by which we decided to hold our national conventions.

DEL. FARRELL: National nominating conventions.

DEL. C. L. Furman (N. Y.): I think it is unnecessary to reconsider. I think I have a word that will clear it up. Instead of stating "a regular national convention," if you state "a regular national convention of the party shall be held," that will clear it up.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will have to reconsider it. All in favor of reconsidering, say aye. Opposed, the same. Carried.

DEL. GERBER (N. Y.): I move to amend by making Section 1 read, "A regular convention of the party shall be held in every even-numbered year."

DEL. KERR (Ill.): A question of information. Is it not true that the adoption of this substitute will be sufficient, and if we have that new section we will have to reconsider this other, and it is only for the purpose of striking it out in order that there may not be a conflict? A motion to strike out will settle it all. Isn't that motion made?

THE CHAIRMAN: There is no motion before the house at the present time.

DEL. KERR: Then I move to strike out the first section. (Seconded.)

DEL. O'HARE (Okla.): It seems to me, as to the time of the convention, that we should have a convention held every presidential year for the purpose of nominating candidates and adopting a platform, and have a convention meet between times for

the purpose of considering party organization and propaganda; and I suggest or move as a substitute for the original sentence, that we insert the words "A regular national convention of the party shall be held in all years in which elections for president and vice president are held, for the purpose of adopting a platform and nominating candidates," and then leave the second clause as we have adopted it, if this meets with the wishes of the comrades. Let me state it again. I have got five minutes to make it plain. Every four years we adopt a platform and nominate a ticket, and we want in between times to have our convention free from adopting the platform or nominating a ticket, and open to do something that we have long neglected, getting a conference for the purpose of organizing and systemizing our organization and propaganda. (Applause.) And I want to say that it is my opinion and the opinion of other comrades here, that while our platform and resolutions are important, yet organization and propaganda are also important; and we have at this convention adopted no measures for permitting our comrades who are working to get together and find out how to work better. It is the intention of this second convention to enable them to get together. I want to say that at the conferences of the state secretaries, of which we had three, for an hour and a half, or an hour, at which over half of the state secretaries and organizers met, they did not talk hot air, but they got down to business. (Applause.) I believe that Comrade Chase or any other comrade who took part in that conference will agree that we talked more solid substantial business in the hour, or hour and a half, than they could possibly talk on organization and propaganda before a convention which comes here for the purpose of nominating a ticket and adopting a platform. Let me state my motion again: That every four years we have a convention to nominate a ticket and adopt a platform, and every two years between we do not adopt a platform or nominate, but we have it as a conference of the workers of the Socialist Party, selected, if you please, out of the com-

rades who have experience by the membership of their own state. They have got sense enough to know who are doing the work, and I trust they will send the workers to that body. One more point, as to the expense. The railroad fare for this convention is \$8,000, and I will go back to Oklahoma and I will raise \$700 more or begin to raise it to send the workers to this workers' convention, through a tax on every member for four years.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there a second to the motion? (Motion seconded.) It has been moved and seconded to substitute Comrade O'Hare's motion in place of the one that was offered.

DEL. FARRELL: I move as an amendment to the motion, that this matter be referred to the committee to draft it in its proper form and bring it in at our afternoon session. (Seconded.)

The motion of Del. Farrell to refer to the Constitution Committee for the purpose of bringing in a revised draft was carried.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): I wish to make a suggestion. The way the sections of this article were drafted before by this committee, in view of the fact of considering the section as it stood before, they will all have to be considered again by the committee and changed somewhat. Therefore I suggest that we go on to the next article and leave this article till the committee reports.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that is a good suggestion.

DEL. HAGEL (Okla.): I object.

THE CHAIRMAN: It cannot be done except by motion.

DEL. HAGEL: I would like to state my reasons why I think we should go ahead. I would like to insert a paragraph stating that in the years when there is no presidential election the representation in the convention shall be one for each state and one additional delegate for every 600 members.

THE CHAIRMAN: You can make that suggestion to the committee by going to them. The next order of business. We will now proceed to article XI, leaving this present article for revision by the committee.

Del. Gaylord read the first section of Article XI, as follows:

Section 1. Motions to amend any part of this constitution, as well as any other motions or resolutions to be voted upon by the entire membership of the party, shall be submitted by the National Secretary to a referendum of the party membership, upon the request of twenty local organizations, in five or more states or territories, or any smaller number of local organizations having a membership of at least 2,000 in the aggregate; provided, however, that the required number of requests for such a referendum shall all have been made within a period of 90 consecutive days.

DEL. GEYLORD: I wish to say that all after the word "provided," as to the required number, etc., is additional to the former draft of the constitution, and that I believe is the only change.

It was moved to adopt the section.

DEL. WORK (Iowa): I want to make a motion to amend. I want to amend by putting in the words "or branch" after the word "local" in both places. It should read "local or branch," because there are a number of places like Illinois, for instance, where the local takes in the whole country. (Amendment seconded.)

DEL. SOLOMON (N. Y.): This proposition might appear very simple to our comrades in the western states where they have no large branches in the cities, but it is different in New York where there are some eight or ten foreign speaking branches run by one member, probably. I say you cannot apply the same rule to a branch as to a local. It will be very easy for anyone to get the required number of endorsements if you allow the branches to make an endorsement the same as a local. I say if a local is divided into more than one branch it should require another local to endorse a proposition before it is endorsed.

DEL. O'NEILL (Wyo.): I would like to call the attention of the comrades to the fact that to make this depend on 2,000 members would require one-sixth of the total membership of the party that voted on the last referendum. It would take a very big per-

centage to ask for a referendum, and it would be very hard to get that number to support a demand for a referendum. I would like to cut that down to 500, and I make a motion to that effect.

DEL. CARR (Ill.): I just wish to make the point that if we are to pit a city like New York with all its branch organizations as a local or a city like Chicago with all its branch organizations as a local against a single branch of ten members in some small, sparsely populated county, it would be very unfair. The average branch in New York City is as large as the average branch throughout the whole country. The whole of Cook County is one local in Illinois, and we do not want, for instance, Danville with a membership of 40 or 50, to have as much power in the referendum or in the appeal for a referendum as all of Cook County. Therefore if you add the word "branch" it will make it just, so that any ward branch of a city may count for one, the same as a local in a small town in the country. I submit that if there are 2,000 votes or 20 branches in New York City that want a referendum they have a right to it. Still, as there are 2,000 members scattered over a whole state or two or three states in some other part of the country, if we leave the word "local" here it will pit a local in Chicago or New York against branches in the country, which is not fair. Therefore I am in favor of the amendment proposed by Comrade Work.

DEL. RIGG (Idaho): The objection of the comrade is not well taken, inasmuch as it requires five different states. It is not a branch of one state that may demand it, but it must come from five different states, and I think his position is not well taken on that.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS (Ill.): I think no measure should be put through here that will allow a referendum to be called by the membership within a single state. We do not want every single state row that starts in this country to be brought directly into the national organization. We do not want a demand for the referendum unless it has the backing of the locals of at least one or two other states. If there are not three or four states that want it, we don't want it.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): I am opposed to the amendment offered by Comrade Work, because there is no reason for it. Whenever we want a referendum, we can go ahead and get a referendum. If you adopt Work's amendment, you establish a bad precedent and a very bad rule. We recognize the local as the unit of organization. In the branch subdivision, it can initiate a referendum as far as the local is concerned, but it cannot and has no power to initiate a referendum as far as the state organization is concerned; and if you adopt Comrade Work's amendment, if any local in the city of New York, Brooklyn, Chicago, or any other large city, or a branch as he calls it, is in favor of anything of any moment, it can go and get a second and make or initiate a referendum vote, and you simply have that one part, and possibly a very small part, of a local to initiate or assist to bring about the initiation of a referendum which the whole local is against. Therefore it would be very bad practice to adopt that. If there is any branch that wishes to initiate a referendum, let them get the endorsement of the whole local before they initiate it.

DEL. FARRELL (Ohio): It seems to me that the matter as drafted there should be adopted to constitute our organization. The number of states included there is only one-eighth of the states of the union. The membership at the present time is about 40,000, with only one-twentieth of our membership required for this purpose. Isn't that enough? Our organization is destined to grow much more rapidly in the future than in the past. Therefore I say, as we have wasted much valuable time in our convention and left some of the critical work for the last twenty-four hours, let us adopt this recommendation of the committee and you will make no mistake.

DEL. WORK: I made this motion for the benefit of New York and Chicago. I want it to be generally understood, because for example I live in a town where we only have one local and no branches whatever. The local has somewhere between 50 and 100 members, and the present section as reported by the committee gives our local there with 50 or 75 members as

much power as the whole of Local Cook County or the whole of Local New York City, and I want our local only to have the same power which one assembly district has in New York City, so (turning to the New York delegation) I say I make the motion for your benefit, not for ours.

DEL. KONIKOW (Mass.): I am in favor of Comrade Work's amendment. Comrade Solomon says that some of the foreign branches are run by one member. I emphatically protest against that. The foreign branches ought to stand exactly the same chance as any other branch. I think there is another provision that to have a referendum vote we need twenty branches, and if we accept Comrade Work's amendment, in order to have a referendum it would have to go before the whole country. Now, they seem to think that we members of the party have nothing else to do but count votes. Do you think it is no labor for any branch to get 2,000 members to send out a certain referendum vote? Do you think we have nothing else to do but just work for votes? It is mighty hard work to get a referendum vote out to go before the different branches. It will really handicap the members in the large cities to bring a referendum vote before the party at all if we leave it entirely to the local. That is why I think we must try our best to give a chance to bring a referendum vote before the party in any special locality. That is, it seems to me, the intention of some here. I had some experience in the old S. L. P., where they required fifteen branches to send out a referendum. I think if there is a local with twenty or twenty-five branches and a branch wants to bring a referendum vote before the party, then it will be hard enough to get twenty others to endorse it. Therefore I think it is best to give a chance to all our comrades.

DEL. STROBELL (N. J.): I am in favor of the amendment of Comrade Work simply because I think it ought not to be in the power of locals in the large cities to throttle those that want to express their views. That is all I have got to say.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): There are some comrades here who seem to

have constituted themselves guardians of the referendum and of the minorities in New Jersey, and they always want to guard the minorities in New York. We know how they have guarded them. We have had some experience. Now, we are just as much entitled to a referendum as they are, but this constitution does not recognize anywhere the existence of branches of locals. This is the first time it recognizes that there are branches of locals. The unit of organization in all our local organizations is the local. The national secretary has not got the names of the secretaries of branches; he does not know officially of the existence of branches; he knows of the existence of locals only. It will tend to disrupt the large locals if the minorities are allowed to rule. It is the principle of our organization, whether it is a national or state, or local, or branch organization, that the majority rules. If a minority should be authorized by the national constitution to initiate things against the will of the members, then it will tend to disrupt the large locals. Now, there is a provision here giving the large locals preference over the small, and then there is a two thousand membership provision, which means that in any local containing 2,000 members—and even Local Cook County or Local New York has 2,000 members—it can initiate a referendum, and that is all we want. We do not want to have branches everywhere trying to initiate a referendum. We have got to deal with the local through the national organization.

Del. Williams of Minnesota moved the previous question. The motion was seconded and carried.

The amendment offered by Del. Work was then put to a vote and lost.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS (Ill.): I want to make a further amendment to that. I do not believe that Local Cook County or Local New York ought to have the right alone to initiate a referendum, and yet it seems to me we ought to recognize their increased power, but I do not think that in any one state or city they ought to have that power. So, therefore, I would insert there the words "or any smaller number of local organizations having a membership of at least 2,000 in the

aggregate and reaching into at least two states."

A DELEGATE: "Three."

DEL. SIMONS: Well, I am willing to take three, but I think there ought to be at least twenty members somewhere else in the United States that want that referendum, besides the one local.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you made it three?

DEL. SIMONS: Three states.

DEL. GAYLORD: Make it sure; "or any smaller number of local organizations in" two or three?

DEL. SIMONS: Three states will suit me.

Del. Simon's amendment was seconded.

DEL. FRAENCKEL (Ill.): The tendency of this convention is to ignore the referendum. We have several things passed that ought not to be accepted when this affair goes out to a referendum vote. I want to say this, Comrade Chairman and fellow delegates, that the basis of the Socialist organization is the membership, and not geographical division. I am not in favor of establishing a precedent that will tie the country against the city. It is the old story over and over. They are forcing the issue of the country against the city. I believe that where the membership lies the power ought to lie. I am not in favor of extending the chances for squabbles all over the country. We have enough of it now, and I want to go on record as opposing any tendency to destroy the referendum vote or the membership work in this party organization. It will never do, and it will destroy the very thing for which we are organized. We have our faults; we are making mistakes by doing this or by doing something else, but we will make a bigger mistake by establishing any precedent whereby we take away from the membership the power to vote on any question they want to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? (Question called for.)

DEL. FARRELL: I want to say this. Comrade Fraenckel ought to realize that it has been the experience in our Socialist movement that where a local desired to initiate a

referendum and placed a matter fairly before any other four or five locals, it has succeeded. Our Socialists are not such fools that they won't give you a show on a proposition if you fairly place it before them.

THE CHAIRMAN: The secretary will read the motion.

DEL. GAYLORD: Do you accept my phrasing, Comrade Simons, which is, if amended, "or any smaller number of local organizations in three states having 2,000 members in the aggregate"?

DEL. SIMONS: Yes.

The section as modified by the committee was then adopted.

Section 2 was then read by Del. Gaylord, as follows:

Section 2. Whenever a request for a referendum shall have been made as above provided, the National Secretary shall forthwith cause the same to be published in the party press, and shall allow such question to stand open for thirty days, within which time amendments may be offered thereto in the same manner in which an original request for a referendum is to be made, and at the close of the said period of thirty days the original motion submitted to referendum, together with all and any amendments which may have been offered, shall be submitted to the vote of the party members, and such vote shall close fifty days thereafter.

A motion was made and seconded to adopt the section.

DEL. O. F. BRANSTETTER (Okla.): Is it the understanding of the committee that these referendums shall be published in the Bulletin?

DEL. GAYLORD: It does not say so.

NAT. SEC. BARNES: It is announced in the weekly Bulletin, which is the manner of publication, and goes to such of the press as desire to use it. It is generally used.

The section was then adopted.

The next section was read:

Section 3. All propositions or other matters submitted for the referendum of the party shall be presented without preamble or comment.

The section was adopted without objection or discussion.

Section 1 of Article XII was read and adopted, as follows:

Section 1. The formation of all state or territorial organizations, or the reorganization of state or territorial organizations which may have lapsed, shall be under the direction of the Executive Committee, and in conformity with the rules of the National Committee."

The next section was read:

Section 2. No state or territory may be organized unless it has at least ten locals with an aggregate membership of not less than 200, but this provision shall not affect the rights of states and territories organized prior to the adoption of this constitution. When the membership of any state averages less than 150 per month for any six consecutive months, the National Committee may revoke the charter of that state.

DEL. GAYLORD: I will say in explanation that the committee was of the opinion that where a state organization is not efficient to the point of maintaining its membership up to the figures of 150 for six consecutive months it calls for some sort of action to promote efficiency if possible.

It was moved and seconded to adopt the section.

NAT. SEC. BARNES: I would like to ask Comrade Hurst, if he is present, how that will affect Rhode Island.

DEL. HURST: We have at this time 218. Last year we averaged 135.

NAT. SEC. BARNES: How will it affect Alabama?

DEL. WALDHORST: We have 250 members.

DEL. HENCK (Del.): I would like to state for Delaware that we were organized on county lines, and that it would be impossible for us to come under that head because we have only three counties.

DEL. GAYLORD: How many members?

DEL. HENCK: That is not the point. We never could be; there are only three counties in the state.

DEL. GAYLORD: This has nothing to do with counties. It is simply a question of how many members you have.

DEL. HENCK: I understood it as ten or more locals.

DEL. GAYLORD: Are you organized at present as a state organization?

DEL. HENCK: We are an unorganized state.

DEL. GAYLORD: Then it does provide that you must have at least ten locals.

DEL. HENCK: That is what I say. We have only three counties.

DEL. O. F. BRANSTETTER: I move to strike out the number ten.

DEL. REILLY (N. J.): I just want to refer to the point the comrade from Delaware raised, as to the manner in which it affects New Jersey, because it is organized; but Delaware is a very small state, the second smallest state in the union; it has only three counties and it probably would not be possible for that state to become an organized state organized on county lines. I think the purpose of the committee would best be served if "ten locals" was stricken out and we make it "a membership of 200."

DEL. SOLOMON: It seems to me the comrades don't understand that a county is usually composed of more than one city, and nothing prevents the comrades in Delaware from working along county lines, and whenever they are ready to organize the state as a state organization let them form their five or six or ten locals and they will then have the required number of locals in that state.

DEL. DOWNIE (Wash.): I move an amendment to change the word "with" to "or" in the third line, so as to read "or an aggregate membership of not less than 200." (Seconded.)

DEL. BRANSTETTER: Under the reading as amended, if there were ten locals with an average membership of six in each local of the state, you would have a state organization able to be formed with sixty members, under this kind of organization.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are correct.

DEL. CARR (Ill.): I just wish to call attention to the fact that we have been having the same difficulty we were in a while ago. The word "local" seems generally to refer to the county organization. The word "branch," I understand, is the real meaning of the proposition. It has been heretofore recognized that

branches having five members constituted a unit, and that a certain number of those branches could institute a referendum. If the word "local" were changed to "branch," your difficulty would be obviated with reference to Delaware and other states.

The amendment of Del. Downie, changing "with" to "or," was adopted.

THE CHAIRMAN: The action now recurs on the motion to adopt the section as amended. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. HURST (R. I.): A point of information, as to the intent of this expression "may revoke." I take it that the intent is that that is not to be construed as "shall."

DEL. GAYLORD: No; it is not mandatory.

The section as amended was then adopted.

The next section was read:

"Section 3. The platform of the Socialist party shall be the supreme declaration of the party, and all state and municipal platforms shall conform thereto; and no state or local organization shall under any circumstances fuse, combine or compromise with any other political party or organization, or refrain from making nominations, in order to favor the candidate of such other organizations, nor shall any candidate of the Socialist party accept any nomination or endorsement from any other party or political organization."

It was moved and seconded to adopt the section.

DEL. KAPLAN (Minn.): May I ask a question? The question I want to ask is this: Suppose the Socialist Labor Party desires to endorse our candidates in any state in the union, how about that?

THE CHAIRMAN: Can't do it.

DEL. GAYLORD: We cannot accept it.

DEL. HAGEL (Okla.): I wish to amend by inserting "provided, when the Socialist party has no ticket in the field, that all members of the party must abstain from voting." (Amendment seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded to amend as the comrade from Oklahoma will read.

DEL. HAGEL: I wish to amend

by inserting the following: "Provided, when the Socialist party has no ticket in the field, that all party members abstain from voting." The reason I ask for this amendment is that in a number of places where the commission form of government exists, in certain cases the Socialist party is driven from the field. It cannot have a ticket in the field, and we ought to abstain from voting in such cases.

DEL. FARRELL (Ohio): I move to amend the clause to read that when a ticket is not placed in the field every Socialist shall go to the polls and write the word "Socialist" on the ballot. (Seconded.)

DEL. POPE (Mo.): In the State of Missouri they have a primary law that requires that if you do not go to the polls and vote at the primary you lose your right to vote. We are supposed to have common sense enough to go to the polls whether we have a candidate or not.

DEL. BERGER: If you adopt this it would make it impossible for us in Wisconsin to go into the field in many cases. For instance, under the state law judicial elections are non-partisan. Now, while we put up a ticket it goes on the ballot as a non-partisan ballot. Neither the Republican, nor Democratic, nor Social Democratic party can put up a partisan ticket. They all go on as non-partisan tickets. If you adopt this, we cannot have any ticket. We have a good chance in that state to elect our judges, but we have to elect them as non-partisan judges. You cannot have all this rot and so on; it is pure and sheer nonsense. It is also sheer nonsense to compel us to stay out of the election entirely. Then there may be a state law passed this winter to make the municipal election at Milwaukee non-partisan. What will you do then? Of course we will have our ticket, but it will be a non-partisan ticket. So if you accept this you make it impossible for us to participate in any further elections, judicial or local. If you adopt this, then we have a chance to vote just once in two years or once in four years. Now, we cannot accept this.

DEL. HAGEL: I want to ask a question. Is it not a fact that whenever this occurs, it is the Socialist party that does put the ticket in the

field, but it does it in the name of a non-partisan affair?

DEL. BERGER: Yes; we do it. We put up a ticket, but it is non-partisan.

DEL. GROESBECK (Wyo.): In the choice of two evils, it is better to take neither, not the least.

DEL. BERGER: This is not a choice of two evils. We put up a ticket, but it does not go on the ballot as a Socialist ticket; it goes on as a non-partisan ticket. For instance, our judicial ticket this spring; we had a ticket at the municipal election from top to bottom, but the man nominated for judge did not go on as a Social Democratic candidate. Under the law he had to go on as a non-partisan candidate for the judiciary; that is the requirement of the law. So if you accept anything providing that we cannot vote unless "Socialist ticket" is on the top, then you cut us out. Don't you understand me? You simply cut us out.

DEL. KORNGOLD (Ill.): This clause is absolutely foolish; it is very foolish. The whole trend of events is today towards non-partisan tickets. We Socialists don't want it, but we cannot help ourselves, we are in the minority. The trend of the entire nation is today towards non-partisan tickets. There are countries in the world already where the non-partisan ticket exists, and if the old politicians inside of four years or at any time carry any number of cities for the non-partisan tickets, it means that about half of the Socialist party will be disfranchised. Besides, how am I going to keep track of a man, whether he votes the party ticket or not? It is not possible to keep track of them. This has absolutely no meaning. It can hurt nobody but ourselves.

DEL. KILLINGBECK (N. J.): If we adopt that, it will mean that three counties in New Jersey will be unable to vote on a single question. I don't want to make a speech or reiterate what the other delegate says, but it is a fact that it will be impossible for us to vote on a single question in at least three counties.

DEL. GAYLORD: Our party is a political party. The school boards and judiciary are elected by non-partisan vote. This motion if adopted

would take away the political party, or the party where it was strong and otherwise able to do something practical. Our party has but three members on the school board in Milwaukee, elected on a non-partisan ticket. Do you want us to take them off? We have got a first class chance of putting a man on the bench this spring on the non-partisan ticket. Don't you want us to do that? If you don't want us to do that, what do you want us to do?

DEL. TUCK (Cal.): I don't wish any act to be done here to prevent the Socialist party from putting its candidate on the ticket, but I think we should take such steps as are possible to see to it that while we are at it we prevent the possibility of putting candidates on the ticket who are independents. The organization should select those candidates and should as an organization stand back of them. Now, in California we have precisely this situation: many cities have adopted the non-partisan plan of election, and unless we have in force some rule it will enable members in those places where the organization is lax to lay down and allow individuals to go out with individual petitions and get on the ballot as independents without the support or by the authority of the Socialist organization in that city. We have a case of that in the county of Alameda, where I came from. In the city of Alameda the same law you refer to is in force as to the non-partisan ticket, and in that city they took advantage of this from the fact that there is no rule, and a number of individual members rushed out with their individual petitions to secure the necessary signatures to put themselves on the ticket. The organization was not compelled under the constitution to take action, and it left it to a hit or miss proposition of the individual. Now, I understand this proposition would compel the organization as such to make the nominations in its organization, go back of the proposition of getting the signatures necessary to put them upon the ticket as independents, and then advertise them as the regular nominees of the Socialist party. If we cannot have the names printed upon the ballots the organization should stand back of them and for them and adver-

tise the fact that they are the representatives of the Socialist party, and not allow any individual to pose or nominate himself as the representative of the party. For this reason I hope this will be adopted.

DEL. LEE (N. Y.): It does not seem to me that the amendment is necessary, nor that the adoption of this amendment would produce the desired effect in any case where that effect would not be produced without it. The section as reported by the committee is perfectly clear as to the spirit and intent of this convention, which represents the spirit and intent of the party. Now, there are circumstances, as has been pointed out, in Wisconsin, there are circumstances in Ohio with regard to the school boards, I believe, and there are circumstances in New Jersey with regard to the school committees, I believe, and it occurs in various places with regard to judicial, school, township or village nominations and so on, that we must comply with the law and at the same time comply with the letter of this proposed amendment. We have to comply with the law or else have no ticket in the field at all. We have to comply if we can, and in general we will comply, with the spirit of the party constitution. And I tell you, comrades, it is a lesson that we may learn from observing society around us, from observing the laws of the land and how they work—it is a lesson that we may apply in our party organization. You cannot always prevent wrong things from being done by putting a prohibition in the constitution, and I do not think we will do well to put too many prohibitions in the constitution. I remember that I have read that in the exciting days of the convention in the French Revolution, when they were denouncing different men as traitors, as bad citizens, and ordering them under arrest, one very patriotic delegate got up and said, "Mr. President, I move that all the bad citizens be placed under arrest." Now, evidently the delegate's intention was very good, but unfortunately the proposition was something that could not be put into effect. You have to a certain extent to leave it to the common sense and good faith of members to obey

the spirit of the constitution, and when you go on putting in amendments and amendments that are always additions of more and more clauses, you simply increase the opportunities for misunderstanding, the opportunities for friction and for conflict; you simply make it more difficult for your constitution to work.

DEL. STEDMAN (Ill.): I want to move to table the amendment.

The motion was seconded and the amendment tabled.

DEL. INGALLS (Minn.): I wish to ask the committee, would it not be advisable to put a clause in that section providing that no member of the Socialist party should become a non-partisan candidate in any state where

it is required? In other words, here we have got in a certain state—

DEL. GAYLORD: I understand the vote of the convention just settled that to the contrary of your idea.

The section was then adopted.

DEL. GOEBEL: I understand that a lot of the delegates' tickets expire tonight and they have got to leave at 6 o'clock. I can stay. I want to give them a chance to stay here until the convention's work is over. We do not need a long dinner hour today. I move that we adjourn to meet again at 1 o'clock.

The motion was seconded, and the convention then at 12:30 adjourned to meet at 1 o'clock p. m.

AFTERNOON SESSION

The convention was called to order at 1 o'clock.

THE CHAIRMAN: I know we are all anxious to get what little of our business is still remaining finished up, so as to get away. We have yet to hear the report of the Constitution Committee, the report of the Women's Committee, the report of the Finnish translator, and the report of the Committee on Ways and Means. There may be others.

A DELEGATE: There is still the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations and of the Committee on Government by Commission.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTION RESUMED.

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrades, we are now at work on the constitution. The next order of business is the reading of the next section. Let us proceed.

DEL. GAYLORD (reporting for the committee): The committee was instructed to redraft the section concerning the two kinds of convention. Your committee recommend the following. There are two sections under "Conventions," you will notice. The committee recommend that we insert the word "nominating" before

the word "convention," so that it reads:

The regular national nominating convention of the party shall be held in all years in which elections for President and Vice-President of the United States are to be held.

We recommend that that section stand thus. Then the second section we recommend should read as follows:

A congress of the party to consider and report upon the program, agitation and organization of the party, shall be held in each even-numbered year when there is no national nominating convention.

DEL. GAYLORD: Now, comrades, if I can speak a few minutes on the points included here, I think it will save time. I want to make the matter clear that we want to have two different kinds of conventions. As the second one proposed is for the study and consideration of party matters we thought it advisable that it should have a separate name, and we suggest that it be called a congress, in order to distinguish it from the convention which is supposed to be for nominating. The basis of representation should be such as to cut down the

number attending. I believe those are the essential points.

A DELEGATE: What is the basis proposed?

DEL. GAYLORD: I will say 800. I have that on my paper, but if you want to change it, that is for you to do, and you can do it easily. There is one other matter, in regard to the accrediting of the delegates; you will notice that in the section that follows:

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the recommendation of the committee; are you ready to adopt it?

DEL. SOLOMON (N. Y.): The basis of representation is not clear to me.

DEL. GAYLORD: One delegate for every 800, and one at large.

DEL. SOLOMON: I desire to amend the committee's report to read that there shall be one for every 500. (Seconded.)

DEL. O'HARE (Okla.): To answer a question that was asked me by the chairman of this committee, there was \$8,000 spent for railroad fares at this convention for 220 delegates, which averages \$36 per delegate. On a basis of 12 cents per capita, which would be the tax in two years, the average appropriation for a delegation of 800 members for one delegate, will allow about \$96 per delegate for expenses. If we cut it down to one for 500 members, it would allow \$60. So you see we have considerable leeway. We can even go as low as a delegate for every 300 members. I simply say that if we did, it would cost just exactly the amount that was necessary to pay the expenses of this convention.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): I believe one for every 500 is far more democratic. I am willing to give the minority every chance, but I don't believe in being ruled by the minority. By the present system New York or Wisconsin or any of the other big states can send only one for every 500, while a state with only 50 members sends the same. In other words, it takes about ten Socialists in Wisconsin or New York to have as much voting power as one in Vermont. I am very willing, as I say, to give every state, small or large, one delegate, but beyond that we ought to have a system whereby we shall not be ruled by the

minority. Even with one for 500, ten Socialists in Washington have as much voting power as 100 in Wisconsin or New York, and with one for 800 it would be still worse. That is why I advocate, in spite of the cost, to make it one for every 500.

The amendment was adopted.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): I move the adoption of the section as amended. (Seconded.)

A DELEGATE: I want to speak on that motion. I believe we are making a serious mistake. I got an estimate from the National Secretary. If we hold this convention as proposed in 1910 we will swamp the national office with a \$3,000 or \$4,000 deficit. I don't think we have any business to do it. I think that instead of this proposed convention there should be a meeting of the National Committee. This eight or nine thousand dollars has to come out of the movement somehow or some place.

DEL. FIELDMAN (N. Y.): We have already decided that question, and there is no use discussing it unless we reconsider our decision of this forenoon.

The question was called for, and the section as amended was then adopted.

Section 2 of the report, now becoming Section 3, was next read, and was adopted without objection. The section is as follows:

Section 3. Special conventions of the party may be held at any time if decided upon by general vote of the party membership.

Section 4 (former Section 3) was read:

Section 4. The dates and places of holding such regular or special conventions shall be fixed by the National Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection this section will be adopted. It is adopted.

DEL. O'HARE (Okla.): I want to suggest the following amendment, that the time of holding the said convention shall be not earlier than the first of June, because on the first of June of every year the railroads give a reduced rate of one and one-third fare. For illustration, if we had held this convention a month later the party would have been saved two

or three thousand dollars in fares. (Amendment seconded.)

DEL. GAYLORD: If we change this, then they will change their rate to get ahead of you. That's all there will be to it.

The amendment was lost, and on motion the section was then adopted.

Section 5, originally Section 4, was read, as follows:

Section 5. The basis of representation in any national nominating convention shall be by states, each state and territory being entitled to one delegate at large and one additional delegate for every 400 members in good standing; provided, however, that no delegate shall be considered eligible unless he is a resident of the state from which the credential is presented.

DEL. McDEVITT (Cal.): I wish to offer an amendment. I have here a tabulation showing the cost on the basis of one at large and one for every 200. If you will take these figures you will find that the small state with 200 members gets one delegate for each 100 members. My amendment is that we should have one delegate at large for each state, and one additional delegate for every 400 members or majority fraction thereof above the first 400. (Amendment seconded.)

DEL. SOLOMON: I desire to offer a further amendment, that we add to the recommendation of the committee—

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that to be a substitute or an amendment?

DEL. SOLOMON: An amendment to the amendment, if there is another amendment before the house, to add the words "Provided that the delegates shall have been members of the party for at least two years."

DEL. McDEVITT: We have already adopted a provision that every official should have been a member for at least three years.

DEL. SOLOMON: Delegates would not be officials.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question before us is on the amendment offered by Del. McDevitt of California. Will the Secretary please read the amendment as offered by Comrade McDevitt?

DEL. GAYLORD: The amendment provides that a state shall be en-

titled to one delegate at large and one additional delegate for every 400 members or majority fraction thereof above the first 400.

DEL. McDEVITT: I accept the amendment.

DEL. INGALLS (Minn.): Do I understand that each state shall have one delegate for each 400 members or major fraction thereof, provided that no state shall have less than one delegate?

THE CHAIRMAN: No; provided, as I understand Comrade Solomon's suggestion, that you accepted, provided that these delegates shall have been members of the party at least two years. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. GAYLORD: Comrade McDevitt's motion is superfluous, because the states that have a greater delegation than one also get an additional delegate for the first 400. You get one delegate at large anyway, and if you have got 400 you get two delegates, and if you have more than 400 delegates you get an additional delegate for a major fraction of 400. It makes no difference at all. We can let it stand as it is.

The amendment of Del. McDevitt was adopted.

A DELEGATE: I want to offer an amendment and tell the reason why it is offered. In the last three lines is the provision that "No delegate shall be considered eligible unless he is a resident of the state from which the credential is presented." I want that changed to read: "A member of the party in the state from which he is sent," so that there will be no violation of the constitution.

DEL. ROSS (Okla.): That is implied all the way through the constitution.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you insist upon that?

THE DELEGATE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded to include in the section a provision requiring each delegate to be a member of the state from which he is sent. Are you ready for the question?

A DELEGATE: That is already in there.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is it already in there?

DEL. BERLYN (Ill.): Not in that form. He ought to be "a resident of that state." I think the amendment offered by the comrade is superfluous. The delegates are elected by general vote of the party members in their state.

The amendment was lost on being put to a vote.

The section was adopted as amended.

The next section, No. 6, originally Section 5, was read:

Section 6. Railroad fare of the delegates going to and coming from the conventions and congresses shall be paid from the national treasury, and such expenses shall be raised by setting aside 10 per cent of the national dues for this purpose.

DEL. GERBER (N. Y.): For the Committee of Ways and Means I desire to offer a substitute for that section: That the fares shall be raised by an assessment of five cents in every quarter of the year when the convention is held.

DEL. WORK (Iowa): These special assessments are a nuisance.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): I do not see any necessity for this amendment, as exactly the same thing is in the constitution. It provided for 10 per cent, and the Committee on Ways and Means suggests 10 per cent. Five per cent every second year is the same as 10 per cent in one year.

NAT. SEC. BARNES: Here is the proposition submitted by the committee, which I hope will not be adopted. I do not want to occupy your time, but I do want to say a few words in support of my opinion. I think the greatest accomplishment of this party from the organization standpoint, up to this time, is the fact that we have, by the special assessment levied recently, covered our entire liabilities on this score. There was not a man in the movement, I believe, who thought we would be able to do that; not a man who believed that we had sufficient vim and sufficient money in our organization to rise to the occasion. Aside from that, I think it is an excellent means of agitation, preparing for a convention. Every member of the party, by reason of this special assessment, has been personally appealed to on the question

of this convention. It has been brought to his attention that we are going to have a national Socialist convention on May 10th. All are asked, as individual members, to contribute a certain sum, mutually agreed upon, to meet the expenses of that convention. Thus it is brought home to them; not only to them, but to a number of persons outside of our party, who have had their attention drawn to the fact that we are going to have a national convention. The result has been that where members have paid their special assessments, their interest has followed their contribution, and this convention has attracted more attention than any convention held by the American Socialist Party. I believe this result will follow in the future from a special assessment. The fact that the comrades over the country have so responded induces me to believe they will do so again. The agitation started several months before the convention assembled. For that reason I believe that a special assessment, whenever it is required in the convention year, is the best means of covering this fund.

DEL. GAYLORD: I owe the convention and Comrade Krafft an apology, and I wish to make it. In the minority report, under the heading "Article X," half way down the last column of the printed page, you will find, under Section 5, which is offered by Comrade Krafft of the committee as a substitute for that which has been read:

Railroad fare of the delegates, going to and coming from the convention, shall be paid from the national treasury, and such expenses shall be raised by a per capita assessment on the entire membership. (No delegate from any state shall be allowed voice or vote in the convention until this assessment from his state shall have been paid in full.)

DEL. SPARGO: I move the adoption of the minority report. (Seconded.)

DEL. BERLYN (Ill.): We hear a good deal about the agitational effect of this 35-cent assessment. Now, we know that this is a proletarian movement, and we know that we are just

at the beginning of an industrial depression. We know further that our party membership is steadily increasing, and to make our party membership right we must go to work and make it as easy as possible to bear the burdens that come upon it. With the increase of membership we have increased means. Now, it makes no difference—and I have had experience in these things for years and years—it makes no difference how much money you raise, you can always find a way to spend it. You can also argue that when you have certain sums of money raised you can set it aside for certain specific purposes. The first special assessment may work very well, the second one may call out a kick, and the third one perhaps something different which we do not desire. I have no doubt that the next national convention, instead of representing 41,000 members, will represent away over 100,000 members. We have minimized the number of delegates possible by doubling the requirements, making it 400 instead of 200. Now, let us go to work and say to the proletarian whom we ask to join this party: "We are going to ask you to pay for everything that is done in the party. This is your party, but we are not going to make it so burdensome that the tax we impose upon you will drive you out of the party." I believe that the setting aside of 10 per cent is the common-sense proposition of the proletarian movement.

DEL. SOLOMON (N. Y.): I want to speak in favor of the minority report. The last part of Section 5 says: "No delegate from any state shall be allowed voice or vote in the convention until this assessment from his state shall have been paid in full." If I understand the meaning of this clause it means that if a state is entitled to ten delegates, and they have only happened to pay at the time of the convention the assessment for eight delegates, then the other two shall not be seated. Am I right? If the state has only paid the assessment for 1,500 members at the time the convention is in session, they will be deprived of two delegates, or three, as the case may be.

DEL. GAYLORD: May I inter-

pret it as the committee understood it? No, delegate shall be seated until the assessment shall have been paid in full.

DEL. SOLOMON: What assessment?

DEL. GAYLORD: The full assessment. "No delegate from any state shall be allowed voice or vote until this assessment shall have been paid in full." That shuts out the whole delegation from that state.

DEL. SOLOMON: That is so much the worse. I say it is a very dangerous proposition and will involve great confusion, in many forms. It will take us ten days to seat the national delegates.

DEL. BERLYN: I have had a little bit of experience with this special assessment business. People who are members of the various fraternal societies know that a decrease of membership occurs during the time that they take up a special assessment, or have a semi-annual assessment for the purposes of defraying national or general expenses of the organization. My trade union has had this experience, and every trade union that ever tried it has had the same experience.

DEL. JACOBS (Wis.): There will sometimes come a time, as it is this year for instance, when for a member to pay this special assessment will be a burden. If we adopt this provision that no delegate shall be seated until the entire amount has been paid in full, how will it work out? Here is a state organization that has been at work as a state organization, spending their money as fast as they get it; they collect dues from the members during the year and spend this money for organizing purposes, and they buy their due stamps from the national organization. Now, you say they shall not be seated until they have paid the special assessment. Perhaps the times are such that they are not able to pay their special assessment. I am opposed to both of these propositions, the original report of the committee and the minority report, and I wish to offer a substitute for the whole, and I wish to explain why. My substitute is that "The railroad fare of the delegates going to and coming from the conventions shall be paid from the national

treasury." What sense is there in setting aside 10 per cent? If that is more than enough to pay it, it remains in the treasury; if it is not enough to pay, what are you going to do about it? Why not pay it from the national treasury?

DEL. SLOBODIN: Comrade Barnes has privately informed me that the average balance in the national treasury during the last year or so, the daily balance was about \$60 and the monthly balance about \$100. If conventions are to be held every two years, at an expense of \$7,000 or \$8,000 for the railroad fares of the delegates, where shall we get it?

DEL. GAYLORD: The idea is that out of the general funds of the organization a certain amount should be set aside for the purpose of meeting these expenses, and should always be held on hand and should not be spent for any other purpose; that is all. It stands to reason that you must either have a special assessment or you must set aside a certain amount for the purpose of paying these expenses; because the national office is run always according to the money on hand. It does not lay aside thousands of dollars for contingent expenses, unless authorized to do it.

DEL. PAULITSCH (N. Y.): I am opposed to the substitute offered by the delegate from Wisconsin, and also to the proposition of the minority committee. I believe the one brought in by the Constitution Committee is the right one, and I hope to see it adopted. I take this position because of the experience I have had with various organizations that I am affiliated with.

DEL. KEARNS (N. J.): I want to explain the position of the State of New Jersey. There was no intention on the part of the framers of that resolution to debar any from the convention save those who are not provided for by the payment to the national treasury of the assessment. That is, if there is a delegation of ten, and the assessment has provided for but eight, two shall be excluded. That was the intention of this resolution, and it has simply been misstated in the minority report.

DEL. FARRELL (Ohio): I believe we ought to make this section of our constitution a little bit elastic. I don't think we are going to lose anything by placing a little more power in the hands of our National Secretary and Executive Committee, and if this 10 per cent fails to defray the expenses of any national convention, they should have the power to raise the balance in other ways. I would like to add, to the original proposition, that in case the 10 per cent fails to cover the expense of any national convention, that the National Executive Committee, in connection with the National Secretary, shall have the power to raise the necessary amount by a special assessment. It could probably be done by an assessment of two or three cents per member.

THE CHAIRMAN: You can bring that up after this is settled. The vote is first upon the substitute offered by Del. Jacobs of Wisconsin, providing that the funds for the delegates' fares shall be paid out of the general funds of the party. That has been offered as a substitute for the whole. Are you ready for the question? All in favor please say aye; contrary, no. The noes have it and the motion is lost. The next question is on the minority report of the committee.

NAT. SEC. BARNES: Since the delegates have divided this report in their argument, I think it would be well to divide the minority report, which covers two subjects, so that we can vote intelligently on each one. It reads as follows: "Railroad fares of the delegates going to and coming from the convention shall be paid from the national treasury, and such expenses shall be raised by a per capita assessment on the entire membership." That is one part of it; the other part is: "No delegate from any state shall be allowed voice or vote in the convention until this assessment from his state shall have been paid in full."

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection we will divide the question into those two parts. (Question called for.) We will vote first on the part that he read first. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. SNYDER (Kan.): I wish to

say that I am in favor of the original report of the committee, for this reason, that we have a state organization fund for which dues are collected each month. The membership, instead of paying into this organization fund, had to pay this 35 cents to the national office, and it cost the State of Kansas about \$100 that went into the national treasury and came out of the state organization fund. I believe the national office ought to provide for the delegates' fares, and leave our state organization fund alone.

The question was put on the adoption of the first part of the minority report, and the result being in doubt, a vote was taken by a show of hands, resulting in the adoption of the part in question by a vote of 69 in favor and 34 against.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question now comes upon the adoption of the second part of the minority report. The Secretary will read the second part.

Del. Gaylord read the second part.

DEL. KEARNS (N. J.): I move to amend by adding that the delegations be seated in proportion to the amount of assessment paid by their respective states. (Amendment seconded.)

DEL. D'ORSAY (Mass.): I would like to ask the mover of that amendment, who is to decide which of the delegates are to be seated?

DEL. POPE (Mo.): If we have a provision of that kind the state that wants to select its delegates from the proletariat will be left behind. Some one will get up and say, "I will pay the fare," and he will be sent there. I am opposed to that part of it and hope you will vote it down. The Socialist Party is strong enough in New York and other places to help the weaker states.

DEL. REILLY (N. J.): We have had in this convention 219 delegates, before some of them went home, representing a membership of 37,000 odd. Some of the states have paid in to the national treasury much more in proportion than the expenses of their delegation would amount to. The reason in most cases where a state has failed to pay its full quota of assessment or failed to have it in sight, is because no effort was made

by the state organizations to get the assessment collected. Instead of that, time has been given to factional fights and retaining control, and, as a result, some states have come here with delegations out of all proportion to the amount that they have contributed to the railroad fares of the delegates.

The previous question was called for, and the amendment of Del. Kearns was lost.

The question was then put on the adoption of the second part of the minority report, and the motion was lost.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question now recurs on the motion that was made early in the debate, providing that the expenses should be paid by special assessment of five cents a quarter during convention years. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. CARR (Ill.): I wish to call the attention of the convention to the fact that the special assessment this year was 35 cents, that many paid double, and that many who are not party members paid; and to fix the assessment so low as five cents a quarter will probably not provide enough money. I think it should be left to the body that fixed the assessment before, the National Executive Committee.

DEL. SOLOMON: I don't see the necessity of coming in now with another motion to make it five cents. Why not leave this matter entirely in the hands of the National Executive Committee? It may be that five cents will be too little; it may be that they will require more than that. I move that the motion be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was seconded and carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question now recurs on the adoption of the section as amended.

DEL. COWAN (Ohio): I have another amendment, just a short one, namely, that the assessment be levied not later than the last of January in the convention year. (Amendment seconded.)

DEL. CARR: I move that this matter be left to the National Executive Committee.

DEL. WILKE (Ga.): I move to lay upon the table the question of fix-

ing the time for levying the assessment. (Seconded.)

DEL. SOLOMON: The motion is out of order for the reason that we have already voted on the other ground which we have taken.

The point of order was not sustained. The motion to lay on the table was then put and carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question now comes on the adoption of the section as amended.

DEL. O'HARE: We have adopted a rule that the nominating convention shall be on the basis of 300—is that right?

A DELEGATE: 400.

DEL. O'HARE: I stand corrected.

Our next convention, according to that rule, will have 140 delegates, if we do not grow. If we grow to 40,000 we will have 165 delegates. There are 218 delegates here, and by the rules we have adopted our convention will be cut down one third. That rule was not adopted with the thought and consideration of this body. I do not think there is any man in this convention that knows how many delegates would be here according to the rules adopted, except those who have figured it out this way. Now, comrades, I don't wish to cut down the size of our national convention. I am in favor of increasing it to an economical size, but not an expensive or extravagant size; and I propose that we refer this schedule back to the committee to investigate if such change is well made when, with the funds at the disposal of our party, we might have a convention at least as large as this convention, and have, to that extent, that much democracy, instead of restricting it to 100 known names.

DEL. FIELDMAN: A point of order, Mr. Chairman. We have already decided that matter.

The point of order was sustained.

DEL. O'HARE: I move a reconsideration. I voted for the motion, and I have a right to do it now that I have changed my mind.

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrade O'Hare will have to make his motion to reconsider after we have passed this point which is now before the house.

DEL. GAYLORD: I want to say

a word on the report of the committee. I am sorry, comrades, that you have rejected the method of the regular setting aside of a small amount from the regular assessments. You have got to raise the money somehow. If necessary to raise special funds for other purposes you can do it. The provisions of this constitution contemplate throwing the work of organization—an expense which has hitherto fallen upon the national office—more and more back upon the state organizations, putting them more and more upon their own resources, and helping them by aid from the national office where necessary. I am opposed to the adoption of the section as it has been amended. I hope that you will vote it down and introduce another section that will put it upon the basis originally reported.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion now recurs on the adoption of the section as amended. Will the Secretary please read the section as it now stands before us, so that we will know where we are at?

The section was read, as follows:

Railroad fare of the delegates going to and coming from the conventions and congresses of the party shall be paid from the national treasury, and such expenses shall be raised by a per capita assessment on the entire membership.

The question was then put on the adoption of the section as read, and it was adopted.

Del. Gaylord then read Section 6 of Article X, which section, by reason of renumbering, became Section 7 instead of 6 as originally numbered. The section is as follows:

Section 6. That the election of delegates to the National Convention shall take place not later than sixty days preceding the National Convention and the respective State Secretaries shall furnish the National Secretary not later than thirty days preceding such convention with a list of the accredited delegates to the convention.

The National Secretary shall prepare for publication a printed roster of the accredited delegates, to be sent to each delegate and forwarded to the party press for pub-

lication. That such list shall contain the occupation of each delegate and his office or employment in the party. That all official reports required to be presented to the National Convention shall be printed and sent to each delegate elected at least fifteen days before the date of the convention and furnished to the party press for publication. At the time and place set for the opening of the National Convention the National Secretary shall call the convention to order, and shall call the roll to ascertain the number of uncontested delegates.

The following order of business shall be observed:

1. Election of Chairman for the day.
2. Election of Secretary, Reading Clerk and Sergeant-at-Arms.
3. Nomination of the following Regular Committees:
Contested Seats—7 members.
Platform—9 members.
Constitution—9 members.
Resolutions—9 members.
Ways and Means—9 members.
Reports of National Officers—7 members.
International Relations—5 members.

After opportunity for declinations the complete list of nominations above provided for shall be printed at once in ballot form.

4. Report of Committee on Rules, appointed by the National Executive Committee, according to Article VI, Section 2.

DEL. GAYLORD: There is a minority report on this, that you will find under "Convention," where it reads: "Add to Article X after the last section: 'The Committees on Platform, Constitution and Resolutions shall be elected by a referendum vote four weeks prior and they shall meet two days prior to the convention.'" The adoption of which would cut out the Platform, Constitution and Resolutions Committees under item 3 of the rules of order specified.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the two reports, the majority and the minority.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT (Wash):

I move the adoption of the majority report. (Seconded.)

DEL. WORK (Iowa): I would like to ask if it is intended to put the word "congressess" in after "conventions" and make it apply to both.

DEL. GAYLORD: In the article on congress it reads that the order of business of the congress shall be prepared by the National Secretary, subject to approval by the congress.

DEL. WORK: I want to ask whether this section applies to congresses as well as conventions.

DEL. GAYLORD: The whole section does not apply.

DEL. WORK: It is intended, is it not, that those whose credentials are sent in in advance shall be the permanent organization, without a credentials committee acting on them?

DEL. GAYLORD: The section on congresses reads, "Delegates shall be elected and accredited otherwise as for a nominating convention."

DEL. WORK: I want to move an amendment, to add to the second paragraph, right at the end, "and they shall permanently organize the convention," so there will be no need of any credentials committee before we proceed to the permanent organization of the convention, and so we will not waste a day's time.

DEL. GAYLORD: Doesn't it mean that by the ascertaining of the number of uncontested delegates and the election of officers?

DEL. WORK: I think it virtually does, but it does not say so; that is all.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you accept it?

DELEGATES: No.

DEL. GAYLORD: There is no objection to it if the comrades wish it.

DEL. WORK: I was in doubt as to the meaning.

DEL. SLOBODIN: I object to it.
DEL. WORK: I think it is necessary, because I myself was in doubt what it meant.

DEL. GAYLORD: Write it out.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chairman has accepted it. The question is on the adoption of the majority report as thus amended. All in favor say aye. Opposed, no. The motion is carried and the section adopted.

DEL. GAYLORD: We are now on Article XII, Section 4:

Section 4. In states and territories in which there is one central organization affiliated with the party, the state or territorial organizations shall have the sole jurisdiction of the members residing within their respective territories, and the sole control of all matters pertaining to the propaganda, organization and financial affairs within such state or territory; their activity shall be confined to their respective organizations, and the National Committee and the sub-committees or officers thereof shall have no right to interfere in such matters without the consent of the respective state or territorial organizations.

The section was adopted without objection.

Section 5 was read, as follows:

5. The state committees shall make monthly reports to the National Secretary concerning their membership, financial condition and general standing of the party.

DEL. GAYLORD: On this there is an objection by Berlyn. He says: "My objection to this article is that the party has no means to enforce the same."

On motion the section was adopted as reported.

Section 6, being the same as in the former constitution, was read as follows:

Section 6. The State Committee shall pay to the National Committee every month a sum equal to five cents for every member in good standing within their respective territories.

Adopted without objection.

DEL. OSBORNE (Cal.): I would like to amend that, to make it seven cents instead of five.

The amendment was not seconded. The next section was read:

Section 7. All state organizations shall provide in their constitutions for the initiative, referendum and imperative mandate.

Adopted without debate.

Section 8 was read:

Section 8. No person shall be nominated or endorsed by any subdivision of the party for candidate

unless he is a member of the party and has been such for at least one year, but this provision shall not apply to organizations which have been in existence for less than one year.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection the section will be adopted.

DEL. C. L. FURMAN (N. Y.): I want to make a motion to have in place of No. 8 as follows: "No person shall be nominated or endorsed by any subdivision of the party for candidacy for a political or state party office unless such person has been a member in good standing of the party for at least two consecutive years." (Seconded.)

DEL. POPE, (Mo.): I am opposed to that, and I will tell you why. We are having all over this country more locals being organized. Take my state. Just lately one county has been organized, and they are getting pretty near ready to elect a county ticket. I know it is all right, but I would like to say that they have a hard time to get men suitable. If you require a guaranty of two years, we cannot hope to have in those districts members that can take hold of this thing.

DEL. FIELDMAN, (N. Y.): A point of order. This does not apply to locals that do not exist for two years.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your point is not sustained, for the reason that he has got a motion to substitute what he read for what the committee has. That would put this out of business.

DEL. POPE: I want to say further that in a number of places our comrades are going to be prevented from getting candidates. In the great state of Missouri, in the city of St. Louis, we do not have enough members to nominate from the local to furnish candidates even for circuit judges, etc. We have to take mechanics and everybody. I am willing to say I do not care if you keep every lawyer off the ticket, but I will tell you what I don't want you to do; I don't want you to say to the comrades in the rural districts that a man must be a member for two years. The proletariat is going from one place to another.

When they get ready to nominate one man who has been in the party they don't know where he is; he has to have a job, and he is gone, and when they get ready to nominate a man he is gone somewhere else to get work. That is why they go. I say, give us a chance to get these people for our candidates. Don't go and put a thing in like this.

DEL. ANDERSON, (N. D.): I want to say for the information of this delegation that the Socialist party for the first time put up a Socialist ticket in the city of Devil's Lake this spring, and if this proposition had been the rule, we would not have been able to put a ticket in the field at all, and, consequently, could not have voted. I am opposed to it.

DEL. PORTER, (Nebr.): I move to table the amendment.

The motion was seconded and carried.

DEL. SOLOMON, (N. Y.): Another amendment. I renew Comrade Furman's amendment, with the exception that the clause shall not apply to newly organized locals. (Amendment seconded.)

DEL. GAYLORD: Organized less than two years?

DEL. FURMAN: Yes.

DEL. GAYLORD: Organized less than two years?

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded to substitute for the section offered by the committee the section offered by Del. Furman, with the exception that this section shall not apply to those locals which have not been organized for two years.

DEL. SOLOMON: Now, it is all right to make an appeal for some locals that are unable to get sufficient comrades to run for the various offices, and we, therefore, are compelled not to place in nomination comrades for the different positions. We have had some experience in New York, and I believe Comrade Furman, who made the main motion, had that particular experience in view. If I am not mistaken about five years ago we placed in nomination William Brewster, I believe, for attorney general of the state of New York, and while he was a candidate he endorsed the

Democratic party at that time. I say that in a large local which is organized two years, if they cannot find comrades enough to run for the various offices, it is improper to place in nomination a comrade who has just recently become a member of the party, even if they have not enough to represent the party. They will create a great deal of trouble and place the party in a difficult position if elected. It is better not to have anyone elected than to have one elected that will make a laughing stock of the party.

DEL. WOODBY, (Cal.): We have known men who sold out the party, and some of them have been members of locals for years. In my judgment, a man who understands its principles is no more liable to do it after he has been in the party six months than five years. Most of the men who have done that kind of thing, who gave us the most trouble, so far as I recollect, are men that have been in the locals for years, as far as that is concerned, so I don't think a few months either one way or the other, is a matter that will settle this thing. I have known a man being in a local only six months, and even before he came into it he might know more about it than some that have been in six years. It is the personal integrity of the person interested that determines as to what a man will do. The fact that some men might have done that and have not been in the local for over a year is no evidence that some fellow won't do it that has been in more than six years.

DEL. GAYLORD: I wish to read from our constitution in Milwaukee. It seems to me this is a matter for the local and state organizations. Under the old constitution, in Wisconsin we take care of that in the state and local organizations. The constitution in Milwaukee provides that any person that has been a candidate on the ticket for the old parties shall not be endorsed under at least five years.

DEL. AMBROSE, (Mont.): I am opposed to this two-year clause, for the reason that in the western country we have a hard time getting members to serve as delegates to the con-

vention, let alone nominating them for office. We have in the city of Butte a town of 90,000 inhabitants. There have been times in Butte, one year, where we had to put a dead man on the ticket, a man that had been dead for three years, because we had no man that we could put on. (Laughter.)

Now, we go into a convention to nominate, and we have got men in some of the wards there who are in such a position that they cannot accept a nomination because their jobs depend on it. The amalgamated companies have such a control on the town that if a man accepts a nomination on the Socialist ticket it is equivalent to losing his job, and the consequence is that in the first ward we had to go to work and take a dead man, a former member of the local, and put the dead man on the ticket, and he beat the Republican. (Applause.) We don't want to be restricted. We have a man there in our city that we elected on the Socialist ticket as alderman in the city of Butte and he was a member for two years and eight months in the Socialist party, and in good standing, and as soon as he was elected to office he sold us out, and we put in his undated resignation as we had it, sworn to before a notary public, and the Democrats and Republicans accepted it in the city council and turned around and renominated him. I say one year is sufficient, and let each state take care of its own business, and let the national office take care of that, and if we have got anything to submit to a referendum we can take care of that, too.

DEL. KUNATH, (Ind.): Comrade Chairman and comrades, I believe this matter should be left to each state and each local to have the common sense to state the time of membership in the Socialist party. We have a member in Evansville who slipped into membership in the local just long enough to be on the ticket and we nominated him. We put him on the ticket as a candidate, and he turned around and worked for the Democrats. He was two years a member of the Socialist party. Now, I had not been a member of the Socialist party for two years when I was

put up for the office of coroner. I had been just eight days in the Socialist party when I was put on the ticket as a candidate for coroner. I have not turned around and sold out the party. I have been a Socialist since 1866, when Bebel made his first speeches in Germany. When I came to Evansville there was not a Socialist organization, and the Socialist Labor party, I didn't know anything about it, and later on I joined the Populist party, though I didn't stand for their principles exactly and when they fused with the Democrats I had enough. I said to the populist members: "If you fuse your organizations together I have enough." And so it came about that right after the Democratic party and Populist party fused together we established the Social Democratic party in Evansville. I became a member of that about eight days before the county convention, and I was put on the ticket for coroner. Did that lead to any corruption or confusion? No. Leave that alone and leave it to the good, common sense of every state and of every local to act according to common sense.

It was moved and seconded to table the amendment.

DEL. SOLOMON: I withdraw the amendment.

The section as reported by the committee was then adopted.

The next section was read:

Section 9. Upon the written statement of five members of the National Committee from three states that they have good grounds for believing the provisions of this constitution to have been violated by any state organization, the National Executive Committee shall fix a date for the hearing of both sides to the controversy. If, after the hearing, a majority of the National Executive Committee believes the charges to be well founded, it shall transmit the statements of both sides to the party press and to the members of the National Committee. Thereupon the charter of a state may be recalled after a majority of the National Committee so decides and such decision has been ratified by a referendum vote of the party initiated for this purpose by the National Committee.

It was moved and seconded to adopt the section.

DEL. BERGER, (Wis.): I want to speak against the adoption of that section.

DEL. STEDMAN, (Ill.): So do I.

DEL. BERGER: For the following reasons: It is absolutely contrary in spirit and in execution to the section, Sec. 4, that you have adopted just about five minutes before. Now, what is the sense and the use of adopting state autonomy in one clause, and then open another door and knock it in the head? If you had had this other in, our party would have been split up about five times during the last six years, State autonomy has kept us from interfering in Washington, and having a cleavage all through the country. State autonomy has prevented getting into trouble in Utah, Nebraska, and in a good many other cases. Why not let the comrades settle it themselves? It is entirely unnecessary, and once, when you tried to override state autonomy in the case of Wisconsin you almost got yourselves into trouble. Leave it to the comrades in the respective states. The constitution and the principle of state autonomy has worked well. Please do not try to override it simply by opening new gates and new ways of interference. You will find it will require scientific, uncompromising, clear-cut, revolutionary, and so on—class conscious, I have omitted one—National Committeemen who will find fault with almost anything, and you will have troubles continuously. You can find even now they will find fault with everything we have done here. They will find fault with nominations and with the Socialist movement in its tactics, and you will have continuous trouble. We got along so nicely with the principles of the constitution as we had them until now. Don't kill a good thing. I move that this be stricken out.

DEL. STEDMAN: Move to table.

DEL. BERGER: I move that it be tabled.

DEL. STEDMAN: I second the motion to table.

DEL. SLOBODIN: A point of order. A man can't make a speech and make a motion to table.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your point of order is well taken.

DEL. STEDMAN: I now move to lay on the table. (Seconded.)

DEL. HERMAN: A point of order. This means to lay the amendment on the table?

DEL. STEDMAN: It means to lay the whole thing on the table.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor of the motion to lay on the table say aye. Opposed, no.

A division was called for, and a vote being taken by a show of hands, the motion to lay on the table was carried, 73 in favor, 28 against.

The next section was read, becoming Section 9, instead of 10, as originally numbered:

Section 9. In case of controversy in any state as to the validity of the title of its officers and the question of recognition by the national organization, a referendum of the membership of said state to determine the question may be taken in the following manner:

A call signed by not less than one-third of the total membership of the state in good standing at the time the controversy arose, asking the National Executive Committee to conduct a referendum of the said state membership for the election of officers for the position in dispute shall be filed with the National Secretary.

Upon receiving such call the National Executive Committee shall conduct a referendum of the membership of said state for the election of officers for the position in dispute. All locals appearing on the state list at the national headquarters in good standing at the time the controversy arose shall be privileged to make nominations, and all members in good standing at that time shall be entitled to vote.

DEL. GAYLORD: This is the article that was adopted recently by the referendum.

DEL. SLOBODIN: There is a minority report.

DEL. SOLOMON: I move that this be tabled. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded that this section be laid on the table.

DEL. WALDHORST, (Ala.): I want to know whether this article was adopted by a referendum of the party.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. WALDHORST: Then I want it to stay in there.

The motion to lay on the table was lost.

DEL. ROSS, (Okla.): I move the adoption of the majority report, (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded that the report of the committee be adopted. Are you ready for the question? (Question called for.)

DEL. HERMAN, (Wash.): I think Washington at least has a right to be heard on this proposition.

THE CHAIRMAN: Everybody has got a right to be heard.

DEL. HERMAN: This has afflicted us to some extent. I want to appeal to your common sense. In the state of Washington, under the pretense of getting one-third of the membership in good standing at the time the controversy arose, people have gone out in the state in the name of a temporary committee of the Socialist party and have gotten signatures to petitions, and many of these signatures were of people who were not only not members of the party at the time that the controversy began, but were never members of the party, and I have in my pocket at the present time a resolution from a local in Hamilton, Washington, that I want to read in connection with this, to prove my statement. A copy of this is on file in the national office.

"The members of the local of this place desire to call your attention to some important existing facts regarding the facts of some individuals working in the interest of the temporary committee of the Socialist party of Washington, located in Seattle.

"First: That an attempt was made by fraudulent means and trickery to disrupt and disorganize this local with the ultimate purpose of turning it over to said temporary committee.

"Second: That many signatures have been placed petitioning for a referendum vote to remove the present state committee of the Socialist party of Washington, of persons who

were not members of the Socialist party or of any local. Likewise, those members of Hamilton local who signed said petitions, on having a clearer understanding of the premises, now repudiate and condemn said petition.

"Third: That bulletin No. 3 for March, sent out by the temporary committee, states that they have a local at this place, which, to our knowledge, has no existence.

"Fourth: The work of the temporary committee has been fraudulent, crooked and unreliable, and condemns itself at this place. It is not an exemplary effort and if taken as a criterion of other localities, we condemn it from start to finish. Therefore, we, the undersigned members of Hamilton Local present at this meeting, demand that our names be withdrawn from said petition.

"(Signed.) C. W. PIERCE,

Cor. Secretary;

THOMAS W. THOMPSON, Chairman;

JOHN B. FLICK,

B. W. PIERCE,

W. B. FENN,

N. JOHNSON,

E. O. RICHARDSON,

E. B. FLICK,

THOMAS BOLAN,

A. J. WEAVER,

I. M. JOHNSTON,

R. L. JOHNSTON."

Now, we have gone to other places in the state of Washington, where similar conditions prevail, and some of the representatives of this same organization went to Aberdeen, Washington, and got members who were expelled from the party because they had voted for candidates nominated by the Republican and Democratic parties; they were expelled from the party, and these people organized, and I doubt not but what their signatures also appear on the petition. They have accepted the signatures of men and women who were not only members at the time the controversy began, but who were never members of the party and perhaps never will be if they first understand Socialism.

Therefore, I say that the same conditions which prevail in the state of Washington will also prevail in your state in case you carry this amend-

ment, and allow a certain element to create trouble within your organization. I therefore move, Comrade Chairman, that this portion be stricken out from the constitution. (Seconded.)

DEL. BERGER: Comrade Herman did not add an iota in favor of striking out this proposition. His experience proves the possibility of protecting a minority and at the same time guaranteeing the right of the majority. He was up before the executive board. All of them were up before the executive board. We investigated the proposition right here last week, and, finding that a number of members there stated to have been in opposition were not there under their signatures, and, furthermore, listening to different arguments, we declared that we had no power in the premises under the same rule. So, why strike out a proposition which works beneficially in your own experience, Comrade, right over there? They brought over 700 signatures, but not half of them were in the party at the time this happened, and, therefore, we ruled it out of order, that is all. On the other hand, there is a possibility of a small crowd, a small crowd of politicians—for there are politicians also in the Socialist movement, I find that, and pretty tricky ones—

A DELEGATE: Berger!

DEL. BERGER: No, sir. I will say one thing, comrades, that, of course we know that every organization of necessity is a machine. You will never have an organization that is not a machine, but at the same time you ought to save the rights of minorities, especially in cases where there is fanaticism, ill will, and so on. We are not angels; I haven't seen any angel's wings cropping out here any place, and, least of all, did I see any flapping in Washington when they appeared and told their story, and let me tell you it was the story of a pretty shrewd lot of politicians managing a state. Yet they have an organization and they took the part of the organization, and that is all there is to it. Comrades, minorities ought to be safeguarded or we would have conditions arising like they had in Nebraska, when about five men held

the entire organization of the state of Nebraska; that was about all. Besides, that has been adopted by a referendum about six months ago, and we have no right to set aside a referendum of the party, a general referendum of the party in this convention this year, no right whatsoever. (Applause.) Therefore, comrades, I ask you to vote against the striking out of this part.

DEL. CARR: I do not wish to discuss the question, and as two speeches have been made, and it is perfectly fair to have one on each side, I move that we lay this motion on the table, to strike out. (Seconded.)

DEL. HERMAN: A point of order. According to the rule adopted yesterday the mover of the proposition has the right to speak after the previous question has been ordered.

DEL. CARR: This is not the previous question.

THE CHAIRMAN: No previous question has been called for. It is moved and seconded to lay the motion to strike out on the table. Those in favor say aye. Opposed, no. The ayes have it and the motion is carried.

It was moved and seconded that the section be adopted.

DEL. WILLIAMS, (Minn.): Comrade Chairman, I move that this section be amended with these words to follow the end of the last paragraph: "All members in good standing at that time to be entitled to vote, provided, that one or more locals notify the National Secretary within forty-five days that such petition is being circulated protesting against the election of these officers." This will make a prescribed time in which this petition may be filed. We don't want to have to go about a year or six months back, and I think it is best to set a time limit at which to make it good. (Amendment seconded.)

It was moved and seconded to lay the motion to amend on the table. Carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question now recurs on the adoption of the report as read. All in favor say aye. Opposed, no. The motion is carried, and the section is adopted.

DEL. GAYLORD: At the bottom of the last column of the report, Sec-

tion 11, of Article XII, as it reads here now becomes Section 10. This has since been approved by a majority of the committee, so it becomes a part of the majority report. I read:

Section 10. The National Executive Committee shall appoint secretaries to reside in the unorganized states, who shall be selected as far as possible from the section in which the state is located. A salary not to exceed \$18.00 a week shall be allowed them, and they shall have complete charge of organization in their respective states. They shall hold office subject to the National Executive Committee, provided that when there are not less than ten locals and 200 members in any state a state organization may be formed, which shall then elect its own officers.

It was moved and seconded to adopt the section.

DEL. SOLOMON: I want to amend by adding the following clause: "subject to the approval of the members in those states." (Amendment seconded.)

DEL. GAYLORD: May I ask for a point of information.

DEL. SOLOMON: Yes.

DEL. GAYLORD: How could you have a state organization without having the approval of the members in that state?

DEL. SOLOMON: I take it for granted that this means, I believe, that the national office shall have no right to send a person there as a state organizer when the members of that state are opposed to it.

DEL. GAYLORD: That applies to the first part.

DEL. SOLOMON: Yes.

DEL. GAYLORD: You did not say so.

DEL. WALDHORST, (Ala.): A point of information. Section 3, of Article XII, minority report, says: "The National Executive Committee may provide in weak or unorganized states, with the consent of the organized Socialists of the state, a State-Secretary Organizer. The committee shall have power to arrange salaries and other details."

Now, there are two of these here. I would like to know whether the committee proposes to introduce Sec-

tion 3, of Article XII, also, or just the one down below Article XII, Section 11, in the minority report?

DEL. SNYDER, (Kan.): I can answer that. We withdrew that in favor of the one read by Comrade Gaylord.

DEL. GAYLORD: It was the arrangement to give a weak state some leeway. It might organize with 200, but if it got below 150 the national office would help it out and take charge.

DEL. WORK: In order to make this correspond with the rest of the constitution it should state there "not less than ten locals or 200 members in good standing," and I so move.

The amendment was seconded and carried.

DEL. WALDHORST: I move to add where it says "reside in the unorganized states," the words "or weak organized states."

DEL. GAYLORD: That comes in the next section.

DEL. WALDHORST: Do you want to adopt that down below?

DEL. GAYLORD: Yes, we propose that also.

DEL. KERR, (Ill.): Along in the second line the word "shall" was, I think, put in by mistake instead of "may," and it makes it mandatory on the committee to appoint secretaries to be selected from the states, which I do not think was intended. I ask the committee to change the "shall" to "may."

DEL. GAYLORD: I will ask how many of the committee here accept that? Comrade Slobodin, do you accept it?

DEL. SLOBODIN: Yes.

DEL. GAYLORD: All right; we accept it.

DEL. O'HARE: A point of information. How many unorganized states are there?

A DELEGATE: Eight.

DEL. MILLER, (Nev.): I am opposed to this whole business. In the first place, if the state is weak, it is an unwarranted interference with the state organization. The provision provides that the National Committee may appoint a secretary, but it does not say where he shall come from.

DEL. GAYLORD: It does provide.

A DELEGATE: I move to correct by striking out the words "to reside" and putting "residing" there.

DEL. GAYLORD: On that point I will say that in an unorganized state we are less likely to find a man who understands the party and its methods who will be capable of taking charge of such an important work as building up a new organization.

A DELEGATE: No carpet baggers.

DEL. OSBORNE, (Cal.): I think, since they are interested in bringing this amendment up, that these secretaries and organizers should be appointed in all unorganized states, not may be appointed. They may be appointed now, the national organizers in any state, but the point is, that unless it is mandatory upon the committee to appoint a secretary in each unorganized state. We want to make a change there. Therefore, I oppose the amendment because it is the original proposition introduced by the committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand the committee accepted the word "may," and it is there. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. OSBORNE: We are voting on the amendment that they may appoint?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, the amendment is to change from the words "to reside" to the word "residing."

The amendment was lost, and the section as read was then adopted.

Del. Gaylord then read Section 11, originally numbered 12, as follows:

Section 11. The National Executive committee is authorized to give financial assistance from the national organization to any state organization applying for same, and having a membership of less than 1,200, to enable the secretary of said state to secure a living wage while giving his entire time to the work of organizing the state.

On motion the section was adopted. The next article, 13, was read:

Section 1. The location of the headquarters of the party shall be determined by the National Committee.

Adopted without discussion.

DEL. GAYLORD: Next, inserting

a new article to be numbered 14:

Section 1. Delegates to the International Congress shall also be elected by a referendum in the year when the congress is held; one delegate for every 5,000 members.

It was moved and seconded to adopt the article.

DEL. SPARGO: I rather object to the limiting of the number of delegates that may be sent by the party under that motion. If they would strike out that clause and amend it so that the number of delegates to be sent should be determined by the National Committee in that year, I think that would cover the situation. As a matter of fact, at the present time we would be permitted to send only eight, whereas it might be advisable to send a larger number, providing we could do it.

NAT. SEC. BARNES: The purpose of this amendment now under consideration is to apply to our delegates across the water the same provision we have applied to delegates to the National Convention; that is, that the organization, as such, shall defray their expenses, and not favor those who can pay their own way. (Applause.) Consequently, I think this should be adopted. If you allow the National Committee to determine, as previously, they may decide on one, according to the finances that we have on hand, or two, and then permit those to have credentials who can pay their own expenses.

DEL. SPARGO: No, no. A point of order.

NAT. SEC. BARNES: Then you will wipe that out?

DEL. SPARGO: Yes.

DEL. GAYLORD: All right, then that is done. But if you adopt the proposition that is now before you, on the present basis of membership, we would elect eight members by referendum, and then we would have to provide the means to send them across the water, and I think that is proper.

DEL. SPARGO: The point I desired to make was as to just that. I think we will all agree that no person should represent the party at an international congress merely because he happens to have money to go on a picnic. That has been done hereto-

fore, and it has not been representative of this party. I think we are also agreed that they should be elected by a referendum, but if we fix now that we must elect one delegate for each 5,000 members, it would mean that we have to elect eight and send them, whether we had the money at the time or not, or whether we were in a campaign when we needed that couple thousand dollars. I say we can very well afford to let the National Committee determine the number, but insist that the election be by a referendum vote.

DEL. BERGER: Coming to think of it, I will have to oppose the amendment of Comrade Spargo. We have an International Congress only once in every three years, and if we should need money we can always issue a special assessment for that purpose. But the expense is not as big as some people imagine. All we need is probably two or three hundred dollars per delegate, not more as a rule. Now, if this great American party is to be represented at all, we ought to have at least one representative for every 5,000 members in good standing. So far we had usually one man there and then everybody who had money could take himself and his wife and his cousin and his grandmother, and could simply have credentials, and there they were representing the proletariat of America. Now, of course, I have nothing against the comrades who are able to go. On the contrary, I was very sorry I could not go. But I don't believe it is the proletarian way. We ought to have representatives representing our party, and we ought not to be stingy on account of a couple hundred dollars for sending them there. I move you that the report as originally read be adopted.

DEL. FIELDMAN (N. Y.): Just a word. I do not believe that it is either sensible or just to leave it to any committee to determine the basis of representation. It should be done by the party as a whole. (Applause.)

DEL. GAYLORD: If I understand the sense of those who introduced this, it will be as follows: Delegates to the International Congress shall be elected by a referendum vote in the year in which that

congress is held. There shall be one delegate for every 5,000 members, and their expenses shall be paid out of the treasury of the national party. That is the sense.

DEL. WORK: Is it not true that the delegates sent to the International Congress have a right to cast a vote according to the number of members the party has in any country, regardless of the number of delegates that are sent?

DEL. BERGER: So far they were proportioned according to the nation, so and so many votes, and it was a very unjust apportionment, because Bulgaria and Servia and the United States really had the same apportionment. But I understand that that is going to be changed.

A DELEGATE: It has been changed. It is going to be changed, and then of course we will have a better representation according to our standing. But at the same time, even if it has been changed, eight men can represent us a good deal better than one can, at any rate; and this great party, having about 40,000 dues-paying members, ought not to be represented by one man, but it ought to be represented by at least one man for every 5,000 members.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS (Ill.): I think a word of explanation might here be in order. At the Stuttgart Congress there were, I think, eight committees, six or eight important committees. Nearly all the work of the International Congress was done in the committees. The fireworks were on the floor, but they don't have anything to do with what happens; they are absolutely for the benefit of the galleries. The actual work is all done in committee, the actual discussion. There has no way yet been discovered by which one man can serve on eight committees simultaneously and all busy. There are always that many committees. The result of it was that we simply had to divide up this year the best way we could. Of course there were quite a number of people who were, fortunately or unfortunately, according to the way you look at it, who were traveling in Europe incidentally, and I have nothing to say against them; they were very good comrades; we happened to

be very lucky this year, but it was pure luck that this movement happened to be represented well upon the committees.

DEL. SLOBODIN: I think ninety days or four months or five months before the convention is better for the election. I move to amend so as to make it five months.

DEL. GAYLORD: Does Berger accept that? I believe there can be no objection, though I don't see why that election should be held five months before the date of the convention.

DEL. WORK: By the time of the next congress we will have at least 60,000 dues-paying members.

DEL. BERGER: I hope we will have them.

DEL. WORK: That will give us twelve delegates. I think six is enough. I move to have one for every 10,000 members.

DEL. O'HARE (Okla.): I am perfectly willing to pay my five cents to send a delegate, and this proposition to a delegate for every 5,000 members, if I understand Delegate Berger correctly, means that I will have to do without three stogies or one cigar to send that delegate; and I am in favor of the European movement knowing that we have got more than one or two Socialists in this country, and if we could send one hundred delegates and it would cost me no more than five cents to send them, I say let them go. (Applause.)

DEL. KORNGOLD (Ill.): I have a little amendment to offer. I think the resolution reads that the expenses shall be paid out of the national treasury. I move that they be paid out of the national treasury or by special assessment.

The motion was not seconded.

The section as read was then adopted.

DEL. GAYLORD: We have Article XV now, originally numbered XIV:

Section 1. This constitution may be amended by a national convention or by a referendum of the party in the manner above provided. But all amendments made by a national convention shall be submitted seriatim to a referendum vote of the party membership.

The article was adopted without objection.

DEL. GAYLORD: One more article, XVI, "Time and method of taking effect." Notice this carefully. I modify this; it was understood in the committee:

Section 1. This constitution shall take effect and be in force on the first day of January after the time of its approval by a national referendum of the party membership.

DEL. WORK: This is not a constitution. It is simply a proposal of some amendments to the old constitution. The old constitution is still in effect and will remain in effect until this is adopted or until next January.

DEL. GAYLORD: Yes; that is, the old constitution.

DEL. WORK: Therefore it should be that "these amendments shall take effect," and so on. So I move to strike out the words "this constitution" and substitute "these amendments."

The amendment was not seconded. THE CHAIRMAN: The question now is upon the adoption of the constitution as a whole.

NAT. SEC. BARNES: It says: "This constitution shall take effect on the first day of January after its adoption by referendum." Apply that to what is before us. Suppose in two months this will be adopted by referendum; it means this, that it only takes effect the first of next January, while in here you have provided that the National Executive Committee and National Secretary and other officers shall be nominated in November. It would mean then that until November, 1909, there would be no nominations.

DEL. GAYLORD: And no constitution, either.

NAT. SEC. BARNES: Oh, yes; the first of January it would be a constitution.

DEL. INGALLS (Minn.): I move to amend by striking out "shall take effect from and after its adoption by referendum." (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand that was adopted.

DEL. INGALLS: No.

DEL. WALDHORST: I move a

reconsideration of the previous motion. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded to reconsider the last vote on the last section so as to open it up again.

DELEGATES: It was not adopted.

THE CHAIRMAN: By common consent, then, it was not adopted.

DEL. WALDHORST: I move to amend by inserting in that a provision that "this constitution shall take effect on and after its adoption by referendum." (Seconded.)

DEL. FARRELL (Ohio): A point of information. I would like to ask the convention and also the National Secretary if it is not a fact that the old constitution stands in effect until this organization adopts a new one.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. BERGER: A point of information. Does that mean that we will have to go to work immediately and elect a new National Executive Board?

DEL. INGALLS: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: I should think it would mean that if this constitutional provision in regard to the matter is adopted by the membership, then we would have to proceed.

DEL. GAYLORD: We considered this; we are just on the eve of a national campaign. It will be trouble enough to get the referendum, and it might disturb our organization at present and our methods. Our affairs have been planned before this convention, and to change them between now and election day will disorganize things. Let this new constitution wait till the first of January. There is only one reason for passing that, and that is this, to get the new methods of organization in the states as provided for here. There need be no question whatever that the present Executive Committee and present National Committee will get at once in correspondence with them even before this is adopted by referendum, because they see the sense of this convention and they will move in that direction as soon as it is adopted by the referendum. The present Executive Committee and National Committee will aim to carry it out so far as possible even before the first of January.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question

now recurs on the amendment offered by Del. Ingalls of Minnesota, providing that this shall go into effect as soon as it has been adopted by the referendum.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): I offer an amendment, "with the exception of the officers of the party, in which case it shall not go into effect until the new year." (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded to amend the amendment offered by Comrade Ingalls so as to provide that this shall apply except to the officers, who shall hold over until the first of January next. Are you ready for the question on the amendment offered by Del. Goebel?

DEL. FARRELL (Ohio): I offer a substitute for both. I move to lay them on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was seconded and carried.

The section was then adopted.

DEL. GAYLORD: There is a section which was wanted to be drafted by common consent, with reference to trustees. This will go in under the "National Committee," I should say, or the article on "Management," Article III.

DEL. STEDMAN: Comrade Gaylord, I make a suggestion that that be referred to the National Executive Committee so that they will revise it afterward.

DEL. GAYLORD: I will read this suggestion of a new section for this constitution:

Section . The National Executive Committee shall elect three trustees in whom the title of all property of the National Committee shall be vested, who shall have the supervision of all title of property. Such trustees shall have authority to accept service for the party, and shall be the obligors in all bonds. All official bonds shall run to such trustees and their successors as obligees.

DEL. STEDMAN: I do not think it is necessary to explain at length. It is simply so that when bequests are made to the party some person will be in a position to receive them. For instance, a man died some time ago out west and left property to the party. There was no one in the legal sense of the term who could take it, and consequently his will was not carried out at all. Such a party should be designated. Again, a bond made out to the

party is valueless, because in order to sue on it you would have to join every single member of the party as plaintiff.

It was moved and seconded to adopt the section.

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): I move to amend, that the Committee on Constitution be empowered to insert the necessary legal provisions which will safeguard the funds of this party; because we are in doubt as to whether the provision presented will fulfill that requirement. (Seconded.)

DEL. STEDMAN: I call Comrade Morgan's attention to the fact that this committee will be out of existence when the time comes.

DEL. MORGAN: I am willing to change the committee from the Constitution Committee to the National Executive Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question now recurs on the proposition offered by Comrade Morgan to refer to the National Executive Committee. All those in favor say aye. Opposed, no. Carried. The question is referred to the National Executive Committee.

DEL. BERGER: I move you that we adopt now the constitution as a whole. (Seconded.)

DEL. FARRELL: I want a word for the constitution. I think I have something that might interest a great many in this convention, and it is in reference to the traveling expenses of the delegates. I wanted to bring it up before and was denied that right. I want the expenses of the delegates paid from the National treasury. I want a reconsideration of the action. I can't make it; some comrade who voted in the affirmative must make the motion that is suitable. The section, as I would amend it, would read: "Section 5. Railroad fare for the delegates going to and coming from conventions shall be paid from the national treasury, and such expenses shall be raised by setting aside ten per cent of the national dues for this purpose." This is the addition: "Such funds failing to bear the actual expenses of delegates, the National Committee together with the National Secretary shall have the power to raise the balance required by special assessment or special per capita assessment."

DEL. COWAN (Ohio): I move a reconsideration. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded to reconsider the action which the convention took with reference to this particular section. All in favor of reconsideration say aye. Opposed, no. The noes have it and the motion is lost. The action now recurs on the adoption of the constitution as a whole as amended.

DEL. HERMAN (Wash.): I rise to make an amendment, if in order. My amendment is to strike out Section 10 of Article XII.

THE CHAIRMAN: I rule this motion out of order on the ground that we have already taken action upon it and defeated it, and you cannot do it again. It is moved and seconded that the report of the Constitution Committee be adopted as a whole and sent to a referendum, as amended. All in favor say aye. Opposed, no. It is carried.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON WOMEN AND THEIR RELATION TO THE SOCIALIST PARTY.

DEL. MILA TUPPER MAYNARD (reporting for the committee): In order to avoid misunderstanding, it is well to make one or two statements prior to the reading of the report of the committee. Many requests came from delegates and members of the party for a pronounced expression on the suffrage question. No one doubted the position of the party. It was only that it seemed best to make it more emphatic that it is a part of the activity of the organization to promote the suffrage movement.

The Platform Committee took as positive action as the Women's Committee felt it could ask; therefore, they regard nothing further on that question as necessary. This is the language of the declaration of principles, "Unrestricted equal suffrage for men and women, and we pledge ourselves to engage in an active campaign in that direction." That, we contend, is all that can possibly be asked of the organization. So we introduce nothing further relative to suffrage.

Our main proposition has to do with a specific effort to increase and make more effective the agitation and propaganda and organization among women. Now, this must not be confused with outside efforts at propaganda. All that

the report of the committee has to do with is efforts within the party, by the party, and for the party. I make this statement in order that you may not confuse the report of the committee with possible activities outside of the party. This we may welcome, but as an organization we have nothing to do with that line of activity. Now for the specific report of the committee.

MAJORITY REPORT OF WOMEN'S COMMITTEE.

"The National Committee of the Socialist Party has already provided for a special organizer and lecturer to work for equal, civil and political rights in connection with the Socialist propaganda among women, and their organization in the Socialist party.

"This direct effort to secure the suffrage to women increases the party membership and opens up a field of work entirely new in the American Socialist party. That it has with it great possibilities and value for the party, our comrades in Germany, Finland and other countries have abundantly demonstrated.

"The work of organization among women is much broader and more far-reaching than the mere arrangement of tours for speakers. It should consist of investigation and education among women and children, particularly those in the ranks in or out of labor unions and to the publication of books, pamphlets and leaflets, especially adapted to this field of activity.

"To plan such activity requires experience that comes from direct contact with and absorbing interest in the distinct feature of woman's economic and social conditions, and the problems arising therefrom.

"For this reason, the committee hereby requests this convention to take definite action on this hitherto neglected question. We ask that it make provision to assist the Socialist women of the party in explaining and stimulating the growing interest in Socialism among women, and to aid the women comrades in their efforts to bring the message of Socialism to the children of the proletariat we recommend the following:

"1st. That a special committee of five be elected to care for and manage the work of organization among women.

"2nd. That sufficient funds be sup-

plied by the party to that committee to maintain a woman organizer constantly in the field as already voted.

"3rd. That this committee co-operate directly with the national headquarters and be under the supervision of the national party.

"4th. That this committee be elected by this national convention, its members to consist not necessarily of delegates to this convention.

"5th. That all other moneys needed to carry on the work of the woman's committee outside of the maintenance of the special organizer, be raised by the committee.

"6th. That during the campaign of 1908 the woman appointed as organizer be employed in states now possessing the franchise.

MILA TUPPER MAYNARD,
WINNIE E. BRANSTETTER,
JOSEPHINE R. COLE,
GRACE BREWER,
M. T. PREVEY,
SOL. FIELDMAN,
ANTOINETTE KONIKOW,
GERTRUDE BRESLAU HUNT,
DEL. GROESBECK (Wyo.): As the representative of a jurisdiction both territorial and state, that has recognized women for thirty-eight years, the state of Wyoming, where woman suffrage is an accomplished fact and recognized by all parties, I take pleasure, as one of the delegates coming from that state, the pioneer state of woman suffrage, in moving the adoption of the report of this committee. (Seconded.)

DEL. MAYNARD: You anticipated my statement that one member of the committee desires to make a minority report, Comrade Payne of Texas.

DEL. LAURA B. PAYNE (Tex.): Comrades, a committee was appointed to ascertain what relation the women bear to the Socialist movement. That was the way the question was stated here, and that was the idea I had of it; and I was surprised that they brought up any such questions as are contained in the majority report, and I was surprised that they appointed me on the committee, for on the committee I seemed to be the only dissenting voice. I may be wrong, but I am going to read my minority report, with your consent, and you can do with it what you please. But I want to say to you now that I hope you will consider this thing clearly before you adopt the majority report,

for it contains more disasters to our movement than you have imagined.

MINORITY REPORT OF WOMEN'S COMMITTEE.

"The Socialist movement is the political expression of the working class regardless of sex, and its platform and program furnish ample opportunity for propaganda work both by and among men and women when we are ready to take advantage of it. The same blow necessary to strike the chains from the hands of the working man will also strike them from the hands of the working woman.

"Industrial development and the private ownership and control of the means production and distribution of wealth have forced women and children into the mills and factories, mines, workshops and fields along with the men, dependent for job and wage on the master class. Into that mart of trade they go to sell their labor power, and when for no reason whatever they cannot find a market for it, they must seek other means of support. Driven to the last resort, men often become criminals or vagabonds, while women, for food, clothing and shelter, sell themselves and go to recruit the ranks of the fallen.

"Whether it be economic slavery to this extent—or whether it be within the bounds of the possibility of an honorable life—the cause is the same, namely, the private ownership of the means by which they must live.

"It is contended by some that women because of their disfranchisement and because of their economic dependence on men, bear a different relationship to the Socialist movement from that of the men. That is not so. The economic dependence of our men, women and children—whether to a greater or less extent—can be traced to the same cause, which Socialism will alone remove."

DEL. PAYNE (pausing in the reading): Now, I wish to say right here, because of what was said by our comrade in moving the adoption of the majority report, it was explained here that we would not raise the question of woman suffrage, but that question was raised all along in the discussions in our committee; and in my report, which I think is the correct report regarding the question up for discussion, I think that that comes in and you cannot discuss this question without it. As the women

are discussing it everywhere, I think since we have brought it upon the floor of this convention the best thing to do is to get a correct understanding of it now, and that is the point we don't want to leave out.

(The reading of the report was resumed.)

"In regard to the ballot in some of our states the men are disfranchised, or practically so, by property qualifications and other requirements for voting, and it seems to this committee that you would just as well waste time in trying to regulate those things as in waging a special suffrage campaign for women at this time."

DEL. PAYNE: That discussion came up in committee while we were discussing these things.

(Report continued.)

"There is one thing and one thing only that will remove these evils and that is Socialism, and the nearest way to it is to concentrate all our efforts—men and women working together side by side in the different states and locals, with an eye single to the main issue, The Class Struggle.

"Therefore, my comrades of this convention, I respectfully submit the following resolution:

"Resolved, That there be a special effort on the part of the speakers and organizers in the Socialist party of America to interest the women and induce them to work in the locals of the respective states, side by side with the men as provided in our platform, and constitution, and, be it further

"Resolved, That great care shall be taken not to discriminate between men and women or take any steps which would result in a waste of energy and perhaps in a separate woman's movement.

"Respectfully submitted,

"LAURA B. PAYNE."

DEL. BANDLOW (Ohio): I move the adoption of the minority report. (Seconded.)

DEL. KONIKOW (Mass.): For the majority report. I would like you to give attention and understand this minority report in the right way. We divided the report into three parts. The first part was a general statement that the majority of the committee should accept a general statement about women taking some position in the party and that the economic condition of women

will be solved only with the coming of Socialism. No one disputes that, and we accepted it fully.

The second part is a statement of great importance. It commits the party to an entirely new policy which really would demand a reconsideration of the statements and declaration of principles already adopted in our platform. The party has accepted in the general declaration of principles the following: "Unrestricted equal suffrage for men and women, and we pledge ourselves to engage in an active campaign in that direction." Now, the minority report opposes that statement; I do not know whether you realize it. The minority report really states that no special effort in the direction of woman suffrage should be taken at the present time. The minority report states that women cannot get the suffrage until Socialism will be a reality. Now, Comrade Payne takes the stand that there is no use for us Socialists to do anything in the direction of woman suffrage; that woman suffrage will only come with Socialism, and therefore that we should concentrate all our effort only upon the realization of Socialism and pay no attention at all to the demands of hundreds and hundreds of women to do something now if possible for us to get the suffrage. Now, comrades, I am afraid you may be caught by some general phrases in the minority report which are of no importance at all, because those general phrases cover our point. I want you to understand the real important point of the difference between Comrade Payne and us. It is, do we intend to do something for woman suffrage, or do we intend to wait until Socialism comes? If you accept the minority report, it means that we decide to do nothing at all for woman suffrage; that is, that we will wait till Socialism shall be realized. Now, I, in the name of hundreds and hundreds and thousands of women, protest against such a position for the Socialist party. If you want to get the women interested in the party you should do something for us today and give us a chance to work for woman suffrage, just as you decide to work for the suffrage of men now. Give all the same rights. I am afraid you do not understand the Payne minority report, and I ask Comrade Payne if I do not state everything right.

DEL. PAYNE: That is one of the main things.

DEL. KONIKOW: That is one of the main things. You see that the minority report means no woman suffrage until Socialism has come to be a real thing. If you assume to adopt the minority report with such things, adopt it, but you will not have the sympathy of the women workers with you.

The third part of it is that part in which Comrade Payne appeals that nothing should be done for woman, that woman is in the same condition as man, and that we should just do the same old way we have done until now, just go ahead in the same old way of neglecting the work until this time. I am afraid Comrade Bandlow, who moved to adopt the minority report, was confused by the phrases, because I cannot believe any comrade should not realize that it is time to do something for women, and inasmuch as we have appointed a committee on the Farmers' Program, and appointed a committee on the union question and committees on many other questions—that it is at least time that we should pay enough attention to work among women to give them a chance to do something in that direction. Any one who listened to the report of the majority will understand that, for we thought it over carefully. We decided to have a committee of five under the direction of the National Committee. We ask you to have women on the committee, but I would be willing to have men on too, but we want on that committee only comrades who really have an interest in that work and will have some concern in that work, just as we have on other committees. When you selected the Farmers' Committee you wanted to select farmers. When you selected the Committee on Labor Organizations you selected a committee who were experienced and interested, and so we should have a committee of people who have had experience in the same line of work.

DEL. MAY WOOD SIMONS (Ill.): Eleven years ago, when I was new in the work in the Socialist movement and had had little experience, I might have taken the position that is taken by the minority report. Today, when I realize that the Socialist movement, if it is to amount to anything, must deal with conditions as they are today, I know

that we cannot ignore the question of how to carry on the propaganda among women. (Applause.) If you will recall, our comrade across the ocean, Keir Hardie, when the proposition was put to him, made the statement that while Socialism came first for the working class, first for the men in the working class, that suffrage was an all important question for the women, and he threatened then to leave if the Socialist party did not endorse the suffrage for women. Now, your majority report simply asks that the question of suffrage for women shall be emphasized. It does not ask for any separate organization. If any one comes before this convention and says that the economic condition of men and women is identical, I must say that that person has had little experience in conditions as they actually are. (Applause.) Now, I ask you this afternoon to adopt the report of the majority of the committee.

You cannot ignore this question any longer, and I believe that if you go out of this convention hall having ignored it, you will have put yourselves on record as not having any appreciation for all the work that has been done across the water by our comrades in Europe. They are recognizing this. The women in Finland and the women in various other countries of Europe have received—or rather those in Finland have received—the ballot, and they are more efficient workers in the Socialist party than they were before.

Now, the only thing I want to say is that I believe women and the men who have formulated the majority report have seen years of experience in the Socialist movement, and they know that we must have a definite plan of propaganda among women.

A motion to lay the minority report on the table was made and lost.

DEL. FIELDMAN (N. Y.): I want to discuss the majority report. To begin with, I want to emphasize the statements made by Comrade Konikow and Comrade Simons, for we thoroughly agree with the preamble of the minority report. But I do not think it necessary for us to define the relation of men to women and of women to men. We believe that we understand that relation. We do not believe that the Socialist movement needs to waste its energy in order to define that relation. We understand that the only difference between

men and women in America is that men have got votes and the women have not, and therefore it is necessary that we should make a special effort, particularly as a working class movement, as a Socialist movement—we must make a special effort to secure the vote for women now under the capitalist system and the same rights that men now enjoy. (Applause.) Therefore, while we recognize the principles that are expressed in that minority report, we do not agree with the stand that the reporter of the minority report has taken. Let me show you the stand that the comrade has taken.

From the very first day, from the very first until the very last meeting of that committee, Comrade Payne did not make one motion; Comrade Payne did not submit a single motion; Comrade Payne did not amend a motion; Comrade Payne did not object to anything that we did in the shape of constructive work. Comrade Payne simply said, "I am going to bring in a minority report;" it was a minority report, tomorrow and the day after tomorrow. We have accepted the nomination on the committee in order to do the work of the committee, in order to bring in a constructive program to this convention and to the Socialist party of America. We did not accept, any of us outside of Comrade Payne, the nomination that was offered to us, in order to block the work that the committee was elected for the purpose of accomplishing. It was the business of Comrade Payne on that committee to advise that committee and assist in its work by her work and her vote, but all that Comrade Payne did was to say, "I shall bring in a minority report." Comrade Payne is a brilliant person, and—

DEL. MILLER (Colo.): A point of order. He is not discussing the minority report.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your point is well taken.

DEL. FIELDMAN: I agree that the chairman has ruled correctly, because the chairman did not understand the spirit in which I offered this criticism. There is no person in this convention that admires the brilliancy and the ability of Comrade Payne any more, perhaps not as much as I do. I am not saying this in order to attack Comrade Payne. My point is that our business was to do real work, and that is what the committee did. The committee recognizes the necessity of not only declaring for these

things that we need, but of organizing so that the things that Comrade Payne stands for herself might be carried out. We know that because the Socialist movement, in addition to being a revolutionary movement, is first of all a political movement; that without being political it cannot carry out its revolutionary program; and because the women have no political and civic rights, therefore, the Socialist movement in America has elected women on the committee. That is why we have them, and we ask them that they shall not neglect the work that the men in the party have neglected. (Applause.)

Del. Payne took the floor.

DEL. GOEBEL: If you give her the last speech I move the previous question. (Carried.)

DEL. PAYNE: I want to say one word in starting. Comrade Fieldman says that when we met in our committee meeting, I was the dissenting voice in the report. I did not accept any part of it, and when he undertook to explain my reasons I forgot I was a woman and forgot everything else but one thing for which I am striving and for which we are all striving, and that is the emancipation of the working class.

I deny this everlasting nonsense about trying to organize the women in the Socialist movement. You seem to think, some of you, that the one who brought in the minority report has had no experience in the work. I dislike to refer to my own work, but for the last three years I have been constantly in the field. I do not speak only once or twice a week, but every night, and I speak to both men and women, and I have no time to do separate work for women, and I never say anything about it being a woman suffrage movement, nor do I want anything separate for women.

In regard to that committee that they have advised be appointed, we already have them because we have a National Committee and also a National Executive Committee, and what is the use of any more committees? And as my Comrade Fieldman says, there is no difference in condition between men and women, I agree with him that there is not, and so what is the use of all this discussion?

I want to say this much on the subject of the woman suffrage movement. We have had a woman suffrage movement in this country for years, but

we have not done much. In the states where they have woman suffrage they still have capitalism and they always will have capitalism. If we could have woman suffrage in this country I would be glad to get it. I wish women had the ballot, but since they haven't got it, by the time that we do get it with all the efforts we would make in a campaign for woman suffrage, the great system of capitalism which is already going to pieces and is falling by its own weight, would have been swept away. (Applause.)

DEL. JOSEPHINE R. COLE (Cal.): A point of order, that the comrade speaking is not talking on our report or presenting a proper minority report, but is talking on a plank in the platform already accepted by this convention, a plank in the platform which declares that we will take immediate steps to gain the suffrage for women. She is not presenting a proper minority report.

THE CHAIRMAN: I cannot see that that is a point of order.

DEL. PAYNE (resuming): I agree that if woman suffrage would do any good or avail under present conditions I would say, let us have it. But you know it would not do any good. It would do very little good under capitalism if we had it, and I know from every reasonable standpoint we would never get woman suffrage under capitalism. (Applause.) Sometimes I find where they understand just a little about Socialism, they talk about the Socialist suffrage movement. It always makes me sick. Sometimes when I go to cities to discuss Socialism I find the women gathering around in parlors and having these little pink teas. I believe in going among the ranks of the women workers anywhere and everywhere. I admire the Wisconsin people, for they have got grand leaders. They are educators. They distribute literature and educate the people, and that is the thing to do. If the Socialist movement is not to educate the people as to class consciousness, then what in the name of common sense is it for? Let us join the woman suffrage movement and whoop her up for a woman suffrage movement. (Applause.)

DEL. HANFORD: A question of information. I would like to inquire of the speaker who has just closed if it is not a fact that in every country on earth where the working man is disfranchised,

we have to make a struggle for the ballot?

DELEGATES: Sure.

A DELEGATE: A point of information. The working men are being disfranchised in this country. Let them make a struggle here.

The question was then put on the adoption of the minority report by show of hands, and resulted 35 for, 70 against; so the minority report was rejected.

DEL. M'DEVITT: I move the previous question on the majority report. (Seconded. Carried.)

DEL. MAYNARD: I will not take your time in this convention, since it is rather late. It would seem from some of the discussion so far that some of you had no idea what you were doing. As a matter of fact, we have already settled, both by vote of the National Committee prior to the convention and by the action of the Platform Committee and in your convention by your adoption of its report, that the Socialists of America are committed to the enfranchisement of women in the same positive, unequivocal manner that the international movement is committed to the suffrage of all people. That much is settled. We do not intend to re-open the question. All that we have provided for is a means by which you can increase the propaganda of our principles among women; these principles to be both the political principles and the general principles of Socialism and the general matters of organization. It also provides that this be done by a committee, this committee to give attention to children the same as to women.

One word as to the principle involved. The question is, shall we devote ourselves to congratulating ourselves on how logical we are, how finely we can pronounce a priori statements of theory, no matter how they will work. If we can only prove ourselves logical Marxians, then practical programs may be ignored, and the enfranchisement of women will be as though it did not exist, and then we may fold our hands as if we were in the library or the academy and be perfectly content. The position of this party at this convention, I am thankful to say, is that we are outlining a definite program. It is a program that you all know ought to be fulfilled, and the reason why we can hope to fulfill it as no other party can, is because our demand for all these things and our de-

mand for the suffrage is backed up by a working class party that knows what it wants and has the power to enforce it.

All these matters that you call in a way opportunism are virtually practical ways of reaching our end. And they would be futile, they would be useless as we know only too well where reforms have proved to be utterly nothing and worse than nothing, were it not that they are backed by a revolutionary party that can enforce its demands by its whole organization, by the whole philosophy of a party that means victory in the end. We are not asking that the old theoretical arguments for suffrage shall go on interminably, but that by the power of the working class the great half of the working class shall be put on an equality in political power with their brothers. (Applause.)

The motion was then put on the adoption of the majority report, and it was adopted.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): A word as to the question of the woman's committee. I move the following resolution: "Resolved, That the Woman's Committee report annually to and its members may be removed or vacancies filled by the National Committee." (Seconded. Carried.)

The convention then elected the Woman's Committee as follows: May Wood Simons, Antoinette Konikow, Winnie E. Branstetter, Meta Stein and Marguerite Prevey.

PRINTING OF TRADE UNION RESOLUTION.

DEL. FARRELL: I want to make a motion. Being interested in our organized trade union movement, I do not think this action was taken yet and it was not my privilege at the time the matter was adopted. I move that the convention instruct the National Secretary to have the trade union resolution printed for distribution among organized labor.

The motion was seconded and carried.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PRESS.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Committee on Press is the next order of business. We will now listen to the report of the Committee on Press.

Del. May Wood Simons, chairman of the Committee on Press, then presented the report as follows:

Your Committee on Press respectfully submits the following report:

We recommend that the plate service heretofore established be continued indefinitely under direction of the national office, and, if possible, strengthened and improved, and that locals and individuals be urged to make special efforts during the coming campaign to pay for and secure the publication of this service in all possible newspapers of their respective communities.

Your committee recognizes that the labor and Socialist press of the country is oftentimes at great disadvantage in securing reliable information on matters pertaining to industrial and political affairs, such as strikes, labor trials, injunctions, and especially the sessions of congress at Washington; and it is hereby recommended that the National Executive Committee of the Socialist party take steps to establish an associated Socialist press service which will provide competent correspondents where it seems to be necessary.

It is recommended that this service be paid for by the papers using the same in proportion to the service rendered; and it is believed that a small sum per week from each paper would be sufficient to make the service self-sustaining.

Complaint has been received that our state secretaries are harassed by requests from private solicitors for lists of local organizations, to be used for circularizing or other advertising purposes. It is suggested by this committee that all state secretaries thus harassed refuse the lists and request such solicitors to advertise their business in the Socialist press and reach the Socialist membership in that manner.

As a supplementary report, the Press Committee respectfully submits the following resolution:

Whereas, Since the last convention, there has been established at Chicago a daily Socialist newspaper, named the Chicago Daily Socialist; and,

Whereas, The said paper is owned and controlled by the Workers' Publishing Company, composed of individuals and Socialist and trade union locals; and,

Whereas, The said paper has already, in the brief period of its existence, proved itself of inestimable advantage to the party and to many of the editors of the Socialist weekly papers, in furnishing them with prompt and accurate daily accounts of happenings of

importance to the Socialist party; therefore, be it.

Resolved by this convention that the party be congratulated upon this addition to its propaganda, and that the Socialist locals and party members be urged to assist the Chicago Daily Socialist, financially and otherwise, to the end that it may grow and flourish and be an encouragement to the Socialists of other cities to emulate this splendid effort.

It was moved and seconded to adopt the report.

DEL. BRADFORD (Cal.): I wish to move an amendment, that where the Chicago Daily Socialist is mentioned the New York Daily Call be included. (Seconded.)

DEL. WORK: I am not exactly clear about the meaning of the first paragraph there about establishing a news service of some kind.

DEL. JACOBS (Wis.): For the committee I will say that we discussed this matter of the New York paper, and the committee was just as favorable to that paper as to any other, but that paper is not yet established, and you will find that the reading of the last line there will cover that point, that we encourage the establishment of other papers. Because of the fact that the paper is not yet absolutely established, we did not feel justified in mentioning it. I hope you will understand.

DEL. HERMAN: I would like to inquire of one of the New York delegation, if it is not established, when the New York Daily Call will appear?

DEL. PAULITSCH: The 30th of May.

DEL. HERMAN: It is not established?

DEL. PAULITSCH: It comes out then.

DEL. KORNGOLD: I do not understand how we possibly can speak of a paper that has not yet appeared, in high terms and give it all kinds of compliments on something when it has done yet absolutely nothing because it has not yet appeared. How can we possibly recommend such a publication and compliment it on its splendid work? It would simply make it nonsensical. Not that we do not wish all kinds of luck to the New York Call, but I think the amendment is entirely out of order.

DEL. PAULITSCH: I will say that when the Daily Call appears on the scene

it will speak so well for itself that it probably will not need this endorsement.

DEL. BRADFORD: I think it does not make nonsense. It is practically established, and it seems to me it would be better to include both of them.

The motion on the amendment was lost. The motion to adopt the report was then put and carried.

DEL. BOOMER: Wouldn't it be in order, to follow out the report just made, to appoint a committee to carry out the provisions of the Press Committee's report?

THE CHAIRMAN: That is referred to the Executive Committee.

DEL. BOOMER: I didn't understand it that way.

REPORT OF AUDITING COMMITTEE.

The following report of the Auditing Committee was read:

Your committee begs to report that it finds the cash on hand in the National Secretary's office as follows:

Balance cash in bank.....	\$6,758.33
Balance cash in office.....	418.65
Checks, money orders, etc.....	424.48

Total\$7,601.46

We find that accounts have been audited by the Auditing Committee of the National Executive Committee up to May 8th, inst., and we concur in the report of that committee.

Your committee has audited the books and accounts to May 12th, which includes the amounts which have been paid to the delegates for mileage to the National Convention up to that date.

Your committee recommends that the amount charged against Oklahoma, amounting to \$158.50, as per the National Secretary's report, be charged off. It appears that the state never received the stamps for this amount, and that it was lost or misappropriated by the State Secretary acting at that time, and was never received at the National Office, nor were stamps issued therefor. The party, both state and national, lost the money, one furnishing nothing, and the other receiving nothing.

In reference to the additional amounts appearing on the National Secretary's report, due the National Office for dues stamps, which, including the Oklahoma claim as above,

amount to \$604.96, we recommend that the National Executive Committee cancel such accounts as in their opinion are warranted, or which in their judgment are uncollectible, and charge same to profit and loss account. As all purchases of dues stamps are now for cash, a repetition of this cannot occur.

We are pleased to note that the National Secretary, in concurrence with the suggestion of the Auditing Committee of the National Executive Committee, now deposits the funds in the bank in the name of the office instead of in the name of the individual secretary as heretofore, and we have verified this by inquiry at the Western Trust and Savings Bank.

In conclusion your Committee wishes to congratulate the National Secretary and his assistants on the accuracy, neatness and completeness of their accounts and books.

(Signed)

MARK PEISER,
DANIEL KISSAM YOUNG,
WM. L. GARVER,
W. W. BUCHANAN,
GEO. E. BOOMER,

Auditing Committee.

On motion of Del. Pope, the report of the Auditing Committee was adopted.

REPORT OF WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE.

DEL. GERBER (reporting for the Ways and Means Committee): We do not think it possible to outline a definite program that would meet the wants of all sections of the country. The conditions, circumstances and demands of the movement in the cities, on the farms, on the railroads and in the mines are so diverse that we regard it as practically impossible to lay down any ironclad rule that would apply with any degree of satisfaction to the various sections and industries. In the main, the questions of propaganda, education, organization and agitation must be left to the various states and municipalities to be worked out in detail in accordance with their special needs.

It may be suggested, however, as a rule, that all localities should urge the comrades to use their best efforts in one move along the line of agitation and organization. In the matter of agitation there are two powerful agencies both of which should be utilized to the full extent,

literature and public speaking. We urge upon the comrades everywhere the importance of securing subscribers to the Socialist papers, and the sale of Socialist pamphlets and books. Again, Socialist lectures have started thousands to thinking and working for their deliverance from the thralldom of capitalism who could not have been induced to read the printed page. Any means is to be recommended, whether in the form of periodical, book, lecture, drama or song, which will awaken the minds of the masses to the cause and cure of their economic ills. It is only a question of getting the masses to think. Observation has demonstrated that any people will accept Socialism as fast as they are made to understand it. An educated people will no longer remain in slavery.

As to the matter of the raising of funds for campaign and similar purposes, the committee has the following to recommend:

1. We recommend the approval of the action of the National Committee that the National Secretary issue subscription lists, same to be sent direct to the locals by the National Secretary (he to send a statement of the lists sent to the locals to the state secretaries), returns to be made by the locals to the state secretaries who shall remit to national headquarters. Fifty per cent of the collections on these lists to remain with the locals, 30 per cent to go to the state committees and 20 per cent to national headquarters.

We further recommend that state committees and locals circulate none but the subscription lists coming from national headquarters.

2. We recommend that the National Executive Committee get out campaign buttons, medallions and pictures of the candidates of the party for President and Vice President, same to be sold to the locals, state committees and party members, the proceeds to go to the campaign fund.

We recommend that the state committees and locals buy such buttons, medallions and pictures from national headquarters only. That the National Secretary issue a circular-letter to the locals and state committees and through the Party Press to all party members and sympathizers not to buy any such buttons, medallions or pictures from any other source than the national headquarters.

3. That the National Secretary send a circular-letter to all labor organizations in the country setting forth the stand the party has taken whenever the labor organizations were engaged in a fight with their employers and why the labor organizations should support the Socialist party financially and otherwise, this letter to end with an appeal for financial assistance.

4. That posters with the pictures of the presidential candidates be printed by the national office giving the time and place where either of the two candidates will speak, such posters to be used in advertising meetings where candidates are to speak.

5. That in the year when a convention is to be held, an assessment of 5 cents per member be levied quarterly on all members of the party, such income to be used to defray the railroad fare of the delegates to the convention.

6. That the National Secretary continue the use of the coupon book system for the purpose of raising funds for campaign purposes.

7. We recommend the adoption of the minority report of the constitution committee on section 3, article XII, of the constitution.

8. That the National Executive Committee and the National Secretary send a companion along with our candidates for President and Vice President when they are sent out on their campaign tour.

9. That state committees and locals co-operate with the national office to make the ensuing campaign a success, and that all state committees and locals are requested to get their literature and their speakers from national headquarters as much as possible.

In conclusion, your committee has the following to say: We do not think it possible to outline a definite program that would meet the wants of the movement in the varied and widely separated sections of the country. The conditions, circumstances and demands of the movement as found in the cities, on the farms, on the railroads, in the mines, etc., are so diverse, that we regard it as practically impossible to lay down any iron-clad rules that would apply with any degree of satisfaction to the various sections, localities and industries.

In the main, questions of propaganda, education, organization and agitation must be left to the various states and municipalities to be worked out in de-

tail in accordance with their special needs.

It may be suggested, however, as a rule, that in no locality should the comrades confine their efforts to any one method along the line of agitation, organization or finance. In the matter of agitation there are two powerful agencies both of which should be utilized to the fullest extent; viz., literature and the public speaker. We urge upon the comrades everywhere the importance of securing subscriptions to good Socialist papers, and the distribution of Socialist leaflets, pamphlets and books. Again, the Socialist lecture platform has started thousands to thinking of, and working for their deliverance from the thralldom of capitalism who could not be previously induced to read the printed page. Any method is to be commended, whether in the form of periodical, book, lecture, drama or song, that will awaken the minds of the masses to the cause and cure of their economic ills.

It is only a question of getting the message to the people. Observation has demonstrated that the common people are accepting Socialism practically as fast as they are made to understand it. An educated people will not long remain an enslaved people.

Fraternally submitted,
(Signed)

M. A. SMITH, Chairman,
JULIUS GERBER, Sec'y,
HARRIET D'ORSAY,
G. W. DAVIS,
THOMAS L. BUIE,
CHARLES SANDBURG,
W. M. BRANDT,
Committee on Ways and Means.

It was moved to adopt the report of the Committee on Ways and Means.

On motion of Del. Work, that portion of the report in regard to coupon books was stricken out.

The report was then adopted.

NEBRASKA CASE.

DEL. GERBER: Here is the separate report of the Committee on Ways and Means on the Nebraska situation. It is signed by the full committee:

In regard to the Nebraska controversy that was referred to us, your committee after hearing both sides to the controversy, as well as the National Secretary, after going through the mass of documents, have the following recommenda-

tion to make: That all locals and members at large of the state of Nebraska continue the affiliating with the party and pay the dues direct to the national office, and that all other Socialists in the state of Nebraska are requested to do likewise, and that a national organizer be sent to that state to reorganize it as soon as practicable.

On motion of Del. Berlyn the report was adopted.

PAMPHLET ON UNEMPLOYED PROBLEM.

DEL. POPE (Mo.): I want to move this resolution: "Resolved, That the National Executive Committee prepare for propaganda a pamphlet fully discussing the cause and remedy for the unemployed problem." (Seconded.)

In this campaign in which we are beginning, there is to my mind one central place where we must fight, and the democratic and republican parties are going to try to escape the issues. They are going to belittle and begot and cloud the issue to keep out of the minds of the people the real issue. The real issue now is, "What is the cause of this unemployed problem, and what is the remedy?" And I want issued from the National Socialist party of the United States a document so that I can give that to my democratic and republican friends, so that the Socialists of the United States can go to the meetings of the democratic and republican parties and there be ready to distribute this pamphlet and ask this question of the democrats and republicans, "What is the cause of the unemployed problem, and what is the remedy?" And if they fail to comply with your request, then you can have this document and give it to them and say, "This is the position of the Socialist party." I hope this resolution will be unanimously adopted.

The resolution was then adopted.

PUBLICATION OF PROCEEDINGS.

DEL. YOUNG (Pa.): I move that the National Executive Committee be empowered to publish the proceedings of this convention.

The motion was seconded and carried.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT BY COMMISSION.

Del. Hills of Iowa presented the fol-

lowing report of the committee on government by commission:

DEL. HILLS: Government by commission is a new form of municipal government and has had various methods of operation in the cities in which it has been introduced. In the main, its general principle contemplates superseding the elective principle by the appointive, and when the elective principle is retained, it plans to displace the party method of election by a so-called non-partisan method. Where the system is in actual operation, it has resulted in eliminating all third party tickets from the field in the final elections. It is evident that its only intent is to deprive the working class from any further participation in an already very limited participation in the affairs of government. This so-called non-partisan movement is one of the many schemes of the capitalist class to confuse the workers and obscure the class struggle and give the capitalist class a stronger hold upon the law-making power.

The Socialist party recognizes that the class struggle exists within the capitalist system of production; that the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interest of the capitalist class, and that all activity is and must of necessity be an expression of the interests of these classes that are involved in the struggle, and for this purpose political parties are organized and constituted.

The Socialist party stands opposed to any system of election of officers in city, state or nation, that will displace a party system of election or any system that proposes appointment to office instead of election. The system contains other features that in the short time at the disposal of your committee we have been unable to fully analyze for want of sufficient data. We find that the form of it is intricate and technical, and that a careful study should be given it.

DEL. HILLS: (pausing in report): I will say right here that it appears our committee this afternoon decided to make a little change—that is, a majority of the committee.

(Report resumed.)

We therefore recommend that a committee of five be elected by this convention to investigate this question and report their findings to the National Executive Committee within six months,

and that said report shall become a basis for further action by the party.

DEL. HILLS: Now, the change is this: a majority of the committee consulted and had agreed, for the sake of expediting the work of this convention, that instead of taking a long time to elect this committee, we would submit the proposition of having the National Executive Committee elect this committee. I say a majority of the committee is committed to that proposition. Now, before we take up the matter I might state this, that there are some delegates here who do not understand altogether what government by commission is. Some have suggested that we ought not to bring in a report against it. Some comrades, I believe, who have heard speakers speaking in Kansas City, report that they were very much pleased with this new system of government. Now, in regard to that, I want to say to the comrades here that President Eliot of Harvard University is very much pleased with this system of government, and he comes out and speaks upon the subject in that way. In this respect, understand, the committee does not take any decided position on all points relative to this matter, but we do take a decided position against the so-called non-partisan feature of the election of officers in city, state or nation. And so it is for this purpose principally that we bring in our report, to show you the undemocratic features of this system, to show you how it disfranchises the working class, how it is contrary to the interests of the working class; and inasmuch, comrades, as this system is rapidly spreading all over this country—and I can say as a resident of the City of Des Moines which I might say is now the fountain head of the commission form of government, admitting to the Texas comrades that the City of Galveston was the first place where it was tried—but since the City of Des Moines has established it I will say that the newspapers report that they are writing from all over this nation, writing to the City of Des Moines to get ideas on this plan of government by commission. I will say this to the comrades, that if the movement spreads out, if it begins to take in all our large cities, cities of 25,000 or over, and if it keeps on as it is, it will only be a question of a short time until the Socialist party will be eliminated from partisan

politics in city affairs. Now, the question is for us to consider, can we as a party afford to be eliminated in that way, or do we want to go on the ticket as Socialists and not as non-partisan candidates? That is a question that is largely involved in this plan.

There are some features about this system that might be meritorious, but we do not know. I believe Comrade Work might agree that there are some features about the commission form of government that are meritorious, but as I say, we do not know. I would call your attention to this one thing; that whenever the capitalists go into the legislature to secure any new form of government, any new scheme which especially eliminates the Socialist party and disfranchises the working class, I want you to beware of what they are doing. I do not propose to take any more of your time, but I want you to consider this on its merits, and if you please, have this committee elected to further investigate the question and report to the National Executive Committee for further action.

The motion was seconded.

DEL. HOLMAN (of Galveston): I live in one of those towns—

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you make a motion?

DEL. HOLMAN: I say I live in one of those towns, and I would like to correct a statement.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded to adopt the report of the committee.

DEL. SPARGO: I desire to move an amendment: that the convention concurs in the first part of the report which pledges the party that it is against the principle involved in government by commission, the principle of disfranchising the working class. In place of the reference to the National Executive Committee, I desire that we content ourselves with a recommendation to the editors of our party press that they give the matter due consideration. I do not believe this is a matter which in these coming months ought to take up the time of our National Executive Committee, so the motion is that we concur in the first part of the report, and that the editors of our party press be asked to give the matter due attention in their columns.

The amendment was seconded.

The previous question was moved.

DEL. JOSEPHINE R. COLE (Cal.): Comrade Spargo does not distinctly state what words of this report we must adopt and what words we shall reject, and therefore I wish to oppose his amendment. One point was to adopt the entire report which states distinctly that we are against anything which tends to do away with partisanship. We are by that means placing ourselves, comrades, on an inconsistent platform, for in our platform we stand for direct legislation, and direct legislation is decidedly contrary to partisanship and intends to destroy it, and I for one would be very glad to destroy partisanship. It is not the Socialist party that is going to help us. The people who understand Socialist principles are voting for Socialist measures. Every movement we can make in the direction of an intelligent voting population is a step in advance. I tried to make this point clearly when you were adopting your immediate demands. The principal thing we should work for now is an opportunity to be able to fight for what the party advocates. Now, as for government by commission, we all admit that we know nothing about it. We cannot advocate it and cannot refute it. But when we state that we are against anything that tends to destroy partisanship, we are making fools of ourselves, for we have distinctly stated that we stand for direct legislation.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the previous question be now put. All in favor say aye. Opposed, no. Carried. Comrade Hills has five minutes to close.

DEL. HILLS: I do not wish to take your time.

The amendment of Del. Spargo was then adopted, whereupon the report as amended was adopted.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF COMMITTEES ELECTED.

Asst. Sec. Reilly then announced that the following comrades had been elected as the Permanent Committee on Farmers' Program: A. M. Simons, Algernon Lee, Emil Herman, Laura B. Payne, Carl D. Thompson, Frank I. Wheat and C. W. Barzee.

He also announced that the following comrades had been elected as the Permanent Committee on Immigration Question: Ernest Untermann. Victor

L. Berger, Joseph Wanhope, John Spargo and Guy E. Miller:

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN SPEAKING ORGANIZATIONS.

Del. Knopfngel, secretary of the Committee on Foreign Speaking Organizations, presented the following report: To the Delegates of the Convention:

Comrades, we are not going to burden you with all the material which came before us for consideration. You have had enough of it these few days. We wish to state, however, that your Committee on the Relationship of Foreign Speaking Organizations to our party consider them worthy of our time and labors. We must not forget that they are proletarians, suffering from the rule and oppression of the same master class you and we who are assembled here suffer. neither must we forget that they are the victims of the ward heelers and prostitutes who sell themselves to blight the lives of millions of men, women and children by misleading those of the foreigners who have not tasted of the food of the Socialist philosophy.

We have had before us Comrade Fraenckel, Cook County Secretary; Comrade Max Kaufman, representing the Jewish Agitation Bureau of the Socialist party, Rochester, N. Y.; Comrade Smith, representing the Lettish Local; Comrade Skala, in behalf of the Bohemians.

A thorough investigation into the affairs of the above named organizations resulted in the unanimous conclusion that our party pay more attention to the foreign speaking organizations.

We, therefore, recommend that all foreign organizations be recognized as party organizations, provided—

(1) They are composed of Socialist party members only.

(2) Any foreign speaking organization having a national form of organization of its own be recognized only if all the branches composing this organization have been chartered by the national, state or local Socialist party organizations, and pay their dues to the respective Socialist party organizations.

(3) No foreign speaking organization asking the S. P. for recognition shall issue their own particular national, state or local charters. Same to be issued only by the respective organizations of the

Socialist party, as the case may require.

(4) All foreign speaking organizations affiliated with the S. P. must and shall conform in every respect with the S. P. national, state and local constitutions, platforms and resolutions.

(5) They should function only as agitation, education and organization bureaus of the S. P.

U. SOLOMON, Chairman,
LOUIS GOAZIOU,
ESTHER NIEMINEN,
T. HITTUNEN,
S. A. KNOPFNAGEL,

Sec. of Com.

DEL. GAYLORD: I move to amend by providing that when application for membership is made by any persons willing to sign the party pledge, pay the dues and comply with the conditions of membership, no discrimination shall be made against them on account of their race. (Seconded.)

DEL. SOLOMON: Isn't that now in the constitution of the party? Is it necessary to adopt a special resolution?

DEL. GAYLORD: There is a good reason, and it is this: You cannot in the constitution tell a state organization just what they must do. The general conditions are prescribed in the constitution. This is a resolution, and therefore is not mandatory in the form of the constitution.

DEL. CARR (Ill.): I did not understand the remark of the chairman of the committee when he referred to a preamble. He did not read it. If there is a preamble to that report it would be carried with the report.

THE CHAIRMAN: No.

NAT. SEC. BARNES: Comrade Gaylord is trying to cover a situation which is about as follows, as I am informed. Local San Francisco decided to reorganize on the ward organization plan, and it has eliminated a strong Finnish organization which was heretofore conducted on nationality lines. I do not see how his proposition will cure the matter, and I think we ought to have some further explanation from some comrade from San Francisco.

DEL. TUCK (Cal.): As state secretary of California I will state that the state constitution of California does not make any specific provision for the organization of foreign branches, that is, any specific provision that protects them in any particular right. That is

reserved to the local, and it has happened in San Francisco that that local has seen fit to adopt a constitution which eliminates all foreign language branches or organizations from the party. The foreign speaking comrades are compelled to join the Syndical district branches of the party as individuals and take part in party business in the English speaking branches. That has been a great hardship on the Finnish comrades, and the Jewish comrades I believe are also affected in the same way and they have the same ground of complaint. The Finnish comrades protested against being deprived of the right of language organization, but I felt that I could do nothing in the matter as state secretary, as the local had the power in its hands. The Finnish comrades there still maintain a strong Finnish organization, pay dues to themselves or to their organization, but do not have the party stamp and have no part in party organization affairs. It is a hardship, and if this convention would do anything to help the matter it would be well for it to do it. But I fail to see how under state autonomy it can do it except by putting it in the constitution.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question before the house is the adoption of the resolution offered by the comrade.

DEL. McDEVITT (Cal.): A question of privilege. I am local organizer in the state.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am not sure that the convention wants to hear a personal statement from an organizer. Does the convention want to hear it?

DELEGATES: Yes.

DEL. McDEVITT: The question of San Francisco is brought up, and the chair has heard from San Francisco, and I would like to answer if the chair will permit.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right.

DEL. McDEVITT: We have a large organization of the Finnish comrades in San Francisco. The headquarters of the local are in a hall owned by the members of the local in San Francisco. The Finnish comrades at present, so far as I know, are in entire harmony with the organization. A number of them are members. We get along there nicely together. We have just co-operated in a May day Call in which an even number, comparatively speaking, of nationalities co-operated, and it was an immense suc-

cess. I have not heard as local organizer of any request on their part for a change in our constitution at present. I believe, however, that if the convention thinks that some special provision should be made so that the nationalities can have a right to organize all over the city independently and not be forced in any way to ally themselves to the political subdivisions and towns, there would be no objection to that as far as I am concerned. I simply want to make this statement so as to show that at present there does not seem to be any misunderstanding between the Finnish comrades in San Francisco and the local. They are working in that territory and they are not being interfered with in any way; they have their own local and so on. Some of them are joining privately. The whole organization as such does not seem to evince any particular desire to be a member officially of the party there, and when they do I do not believe there will be any trouble whatsoever in having an arrangement with them. Certainly I should favor giving them all opportunity possible there and elsewhere.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is on the resolution offered by Del. Gaylord, providing—let the secretary read it.

Asst. Sec. Reilly read as follows: "That no state or local organization shall refuse admission on account of race or language to any Socialist comrades willing to comply with the constitutional conditions for membership."

The motion on the amendment was carried, and the report as amended was then adopted.

REPORT OF FINNISH TRANSLATOR.

The following report of the Finnish translator was presented without being read, and on motion adopted.

Today the movement among the Finnish population in this country is not the same trembling, weak organization that it was a short time ago. Prior to the year 1904, there were two different leagues of Finnish workingmen, each supported by several branches in different localities and states.

The two organizations, however, did not satisfy even their own members, who found that they were not on the

right track, and that the opportunities for the work in hand were thereby limited; at least with two organizations there was no hope of accomplishing the best results. The sentiment rapidly grew for one organization and direct affiliation with the Socialist Party of America. However, this proposition raised a considerable discussion when it was learned that the Finnish organization as a whole could not join with the party. It was claimed that each Finnish branch or local connected with its respective county or state organization would disperse and abandon the lines of nationality, which some advocated, and it was recognized and acknowledged by both societies that not understanding the language of the country, and inability to express themselves in the tongue, would disfranchise the Finns of their privileges as party members and prevent them from taking a part in the party affairs. But the issue, "Workers of the world unite," became as a principal matter, and with this as a basis all objections were considered and weighed so as to be overcome by some way or other, and in the year 1904, at the first Finnish Socialist convention in Cleveland, Ohio, a resolution was adopted calling for the affiliation of each and every local with their respective county and state organization. The activity in the year 1905 showed much progress. New branches were organized and those already in existence filed their applications with their respective party organizations. The necessity of improving the methods and laying the plans for carrying on the propaganda work was realized by the members, and in spite of the financial difficulties the second convention was called together at Hibbing, Minn., in August, 1906. This convention was well attended and the basis of our present organization was founded and suggestions relating to the ways and means of the organization set forth by that convention.

The activity of the Finnish comrades and the difficulties in the language compelled them to hire some one to do the translating. This was tried in the states of Minnesota, Michigan, and Wisconsin, and on this practical knowledge was brought up the idea of establishing a National Finnish Translator's office for the benefit of every Finnish branch in the country, and locating the same

at the National Headquarters of the Socialist Party. A committee was elected at the convention to make the arrangements with the National Executive Committee and with its permission the National Finnish Translator's office was started at the National Headquarters on the first of January, 1907.

The Finnish organization then contained 53 locals or branches, representing a membership of some over two thousand, and during the year 1907 the number of branches increased nearly 93 per cent, and at the end of the same year showed an increase in the membership of 75 per cent. At present there are 115 locals or branches in the organization, and the active Finnish locals throughout the country number 136. I might say that the exact number of members is not known, for the actual membership should be based upon the purchase of dues stamps, and as there are some states where the branches are compelled to buy their dues stamps direct from their respective county or state organization, therefore the translator's office lacks the real account of the membership of the organization. The closest estimate I could make is about 4,000.

The organization is conducted by an Executive Committee of five members, who are elected yearly by a referendum vote; a general committee, in which each state is represented according to the number of locals and by referendum of the membership. All the propositions regarding the Finnish organizations only are transacted through the translator's office, which also serves the purpose of the central office of the organization, but in compliance with the rules of the Socialist Party all party affairs are conducted systematically by the various county and state offices. By this manner the Finnish party organizations are conducted in accordance to the constitution and the work done separately, each organization working in its proper sphere. For agitation and organization purposes the country has been divided into three organization districts, and a steady organizer is kept in the field in each district. A number of books and leaflets have been distributed through the translator's office, and the party constitution, platforms and all national, state and county matters have been translated from English to Finnish and propositions from the locals for county,

state or national office formed into English.

The office is maintained and all expenses of the organization paid from the general fund, which is gathered from three main resources: First is the 5-cent assessment; special stamps are issued for that purpose and bought monthly by each local; you will therefore discover that the Finnish comrades voluntarily pay 5 cents per month in excess of the regular party dues. Second is the rebate allowed by the following states on dues stamps sold through the translator's office: Colorado, Idaho, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming. The said rebates of the first year amounted to \$558.23, and from January 1 to May 1, \$240.79; total, \$799.02. Third comes the contributions, which have been very liberal.

The total receipts for the year 1907 were as follows:

Balance from 1906.....	\$ 17.94
Dues	4,128.36
Finnish dues	1,652.10
Literature and supplies.....	922.66
Miscellaneous	608.46

Total\$7,329.52

Total expenses for the same period:

Dues to National Office.....	\$1,686.35
Dues to State Committees.....	1,883.78
Literature and supplies.....	1,199.23
Miscellaneous	1,776.09
Balance to hand	784.07

Total\$7,329.52

From January 1 to May 1, 1908:

RECEIPTS.

Dues	\$1,701.10
Finnish dues	817.65
Literature and supplies	231.41
Miscellaneous	482.90

Total\$3,233.06

EXPENSES.

Dues to National Office.....	\$ 695.40
Dues to State Committees.....	764.91
Literature and supplies.....	318.15
Miscellaneous	997.69
Balance to hand	456.91

Total\$3,233.06

Balance from January 1 to	
May 1	\$ 456.91
Balance January 1.....	784.07

Cash on hand May 1, 1908. \$1,240.98

There is no doubt that the recent

progress in the party movement in Finland has largely affected the success of the Finnish organization in the United States. Although the conditions are different here to those in the old country, the comrades whose veins are filled with the same blood can not be quiet and listen while the others are doing something. While the Finnish comrades have maintained their own organization, supported the National party and responded to many calls for funds to aid the unions during the strikes, and for other purposes of general importance for the working class in this country, they have gladly and joyfully helped the movements in Finland and Russia, reaching their hands deeply into their pockets to meet the financial needs of the comrades on the other side of the ocean. The keen fight for this principle waged within the lines of the Finnish population in this country has sharpened the class issue and cleared the road for Socialism, so that it now is easy to reach the unorganized with our propaganda.

Knowing that the Socialist Party of America stands firmly for the complete emancipation of the wage workers and for the greatest benefit to the working class, and realizing the intellectual and personal misery of those members of the working class who are using the intoxicating liquors as a beverage and understanding the policy of old parties in trying to maintain the system of manufacturing and distributing the liquors and using the method as one of the strongest weapons against the awakening of the proletariat, therefore the sympathy among the Finnish comrades generally is favorable to the temperance and prohibition movement, and for this reason the executive board of the Finnish organization by instruction of the general committee, prepared the following suggestion to the National convention, which is herewith submitted for consideration.

"Whereas, it is self-evident to all class conscious members that the using of intoxicating liquors is dangerous for humanity; that it weakens the thinking ability, enfeebles enthusiasm, is a check to activity, and its every influence is debasing rather than ennobling.

"Further, its victims, lacking the power of determination, are an easy prey to politicians pursuing self-interest.

"Whereas, it is a fact that the capitalist parties pick up all possible re-

forms just for the mere purpose of catching votes, and using the reforms for bait; for instance, the Hearst party in New York and Dunne in Chicago, in past municipal elections.

"And, Whereas, it is known that the program of the prohibition party as a whole actually is included in the program of the Socialist party, so it can be assured that the Socialist party, accepting the prohibition law, and inserting the plank in the party program, would cut out every chance for the existence of the prohibition party, in which many otherwise possessing the Socialist principles are now enrolled. The illustration can be taken from the Socialist party of Finland, where this plank has been inserted into the party platform, its adoption has been a great factor in the advance and increase of the party in Finland."

"Immediately after the adoption the public supporting the prohibition law was ready to join with the party and willing to help the Socialists in elections by all their might. The Socialist representatives in the Finnish Parliament must be credited for the bill recently passed, which prohibits manufacturing, selling and importation of all kinds of intoxicating liquors in Finland."

"A majority of the Finnish population of America are energetic in the temperance movement, and so occupied thereby as to exclude them from participation in the class contest. The tendency of the prohibition movement is for the general welfare and uplift of the human race, and in this sense is in accord with the ideals and purposes of the Socialist party."

"We, therefore, recommend that a plank prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors be inserted in the Party Platform."

The necessity of establishing and maintaining a translator's office for every nationality should be apparent to everyone. As far as the Finns are concerned, there is no doubt that both the National and Finnish organizations are greatly benefited by the office, and I think the same result could be reached among other nationalities. My opinion, however, is that the main thing is, first, to get good organizers of different nationalities, the kind who are well acquainted with the tactics of the party, and set them on the field to explain the importance of trying to get posted with

the party affairs and into closer touch with the party organization. I therefore suggest that the National Convention consider that proposition most seriously from the standpoint, not of trying to establish translators' offices and offering to any nationality something which is not wanted or called for, but making all efforts to create the sentiment among the members that everyone ought to take an active part in the movement and the vital importance of securing a general knowledge of the movement of all the Socialist forces. This kind of work will require, not agitators, but organizers who themselves are interested in the propaganda of forming one solid, unbreakable organization, and as long as there is a large number of persons in the party membership who are unable to speak and understand the prevailing language it can not be done without establishing and maintaining national translator's offices. These offices should be located at the National Headquarters and maintained under the direction of the National Executive Committee.

Fraternally submitted,

VICTOR WATIA,

National Finnish Translator.

May 10, 1908.

PRINTING OF PLATFORM AND CONSTITUTION.

DEL. ANDERSON (N. D.): Having adopted our platform and constitution, we all want it in a form that is handy to carry in our pockets and durable; and knowing by experience how easily the leaflet form is worn and destroyed, I move that our platform and constitution be printed in pamphlet form under good covers for distribution, and to be sold to the membership at not over ten cents a copy. (Seconded.)

The chairman put the question, but before the announcement of the result was made—

DEL. ANDERSON: I am not through.

A motion was made to lay on the table.

DEL. SLOBODIN: What do we want to sell the constitution for? I demand that the platform be printed.

DEL. ANDERSON: I am not through with that resolution. I want the platform and constitution in leaflet form only, for free distribution, and that they be printed in pamphlet form

so that we can carry it in our pocket and have it handy.

Del. Solomon moved to refer to the National Executive Committee. Motion seconded and carried.

REFERENDUM ON CONSTITUTION.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT: I would like to ask a question of information, Mr. Chairman, whether the action of this convention will go to a referendum vote of the membership?

DELEGATES: Yes.

DEL. GOEBEL: Does everything go? To settle the matter, I move you—At this point some confusion occurred, and the chairman recognized National Secretary Barnes.

NAT. SEC. BARNES: So far as I know, it is only provided that all amendments to the constitution shall be submitted to the referendum, and if you desire the platform to be submitted a motion should be made and voted.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT: I make a motion that all acts of the convention be submitted to the referendum of the national party membership. (Seconded.)

DEL. BERGER: No, not all. I make a point of order. My point of order is that we appointed committees and so on, and that is the act of the convention, and we cannot submit it to a referendum. It is nonsense. But I move as an amendment that we submit our platform and constitution to a referendum of the party.

The motion on the amendment was seconded and carried.

Delegates Lockwood and Stirton, of Michigan, explained their votes on this and other questions as follows:

"Understanding that the individual delegates have the privilege of recording with the secretary of this convention their position on actions taken at this convention, we desire to have this statement become a part of the official files.

"The State of Michigan, which we represent, has at two regular state conventions, and ratified by referendum vote, declared for three important propositions. First, a unity of all the forces that make for the Socialist revolution. Second, for the principle of industrial unionism as against the principle of craft unionism. Third, for a party owned press.

"We have consistently stood by every

measure favoring these points on which the state which sent us has clearly expressed itself, and have as consistently fought all motions to the contrary.

"We believe our state, while favorable to municipal and state programs, or so-called immediate demands, is not favorable to such demands in our national platform, but stands for the adoption of a clear cut revolutionary platform, without such demands, which are in their nature compromises with capitalism. We have consistently stood for the revolutionary program against what we consider to be opportunism.

"We have stood against any and all official expressions of the party on the question of religion.

"Furthermore, we have in every instance stood for democracy, and among other things for a referendum of the recently adopted national platform to the rank and file.

"In all the above matters, we have been in the minority, and inasmuch as a roll call has not been taken, we wish to put ourselves on record and that this statement become a part of the files of this convention proceedings."

DEL. SPARGO: Comrade Chairman and comrades, I suppose we will all agree that we want to go home. I suppose that likewise we are all agreed that we do not want this convention to melt away in a rabble. It is well that, having worked hard all week or eight days, we should end our convention in as good spirit as that with which we began our convention, and I am satisfied that when we get back home and have had time to forget our tired natures and had time to think more calmly of our personal differences here, that each of us will look back to this convention as one of the greatest privileges in our lives. (Applause.) I believe sincerely—and I am not now making the conventional statement usual to such occasions—that we shall admit ten years from now that the convention of 1908 practically marked the birth of the Socialist movement as a political party of the working class in this country. (Applause.) I am not going to ask you to listen to any sort of an address now. It is not even a motion, but I do ask you, comrades, let us rise and join in three cheers for the Socialist movement and the Socialist party.

The delegates rose and gave three cheers amid great enthusiasm.

PROHIBITION QUESTION.

DEL. BERGER: There is something more. We have adopted a Finnish report containing the following: "We therefore recommend that a plank prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors be inserted in the party platform." I cannot go back to Milwaukee with that.

A delegate moved to reconsider. The motion was seconded.

DEL. FARRELL: It was not adopted; it was only accepted.

DEL. BERGER: I move that this be referred to the National Executive Committee. (Seconded.)

DEL. FARRELL: Oh, no.

DEL. BERGER: Then I move a reconsideration. (Seconded.)

Del. D'Orsay of Massachusetts moved to refer to the National Committee. (Seconded.)

It was moved to lay the motion on the table.

Del. Stedman moved, and it was seconded, to refer to the National Executive Committee.

DEL. CARR: There is no use in getting so excited. Let us not do anything foolish. This report was adopted in a very foolish manner by the convention. Not having read it, I did not know what

was in it, and I did not vote to adopt it.

DEL. BERGER: The motion is to refer to the National Executive Board.

DEL. CARR: I do not suppose there is any prohibitionist in this convention that would insist on a prohibition plank in our platform.

THE CHAIRMAN: Make your motion, Comrade Carr.

DEL. CARR: I am not responsible for getting into this mess, but as I have got the floor—

DEL. D'ORSAY (Mass.): A point of order.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS: A point of order. There is nothing before the house, and he has no right to talk.

DEL. CARR: The disposition of this matter is before the house.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. BERGER: There is a motion to lay it upon the table.

DEL. CARR: I am going to make a motion—

DEL. SLOBODIN: I move that the report be received and referred to the National Executive Committee.

Motion seconded and carried.

It was then moved to adjourn sine die, and the convention then, at six o'clock, with the singing of the "Marseillaise," adjourned sine die.

SOCIALIST PARTY PLATFORM.

PRINCIPLES.

Human life depends upon food, clothing and shelter. Only with these assured are freedom, culture and higher human development possible. To produce food, clothing or shelter, land and machinery are needed. Land alone does not satisfy human needs. Human labor creates machinery and applies it to the land for the production of raw materials and food. Whoever has control of land and machinery controls human labor, and with it human life and liberty.

Today the machinery and the land used for industrial purposes are owned by a rapidly decreasing minority. So long as machinery is simple and easily handled by one man, its owner cannot dominate the sources of life of others. But when machinery becomes more complex and expensive, and requires for its effective operation the organized effort of many workers, its influence reaches over wide circles of life. The owners of such machinery become the dominant class.

In proportion as the number of such machine owners compared to all other classes decreases, their power in the nation and in the world increases. They bring ever larger masses of working people under their control, reducing them to the point where muscle and brain are their only productive property. Millions of formerly self-employed workers thus become the helpless wage slaves of the industrial masters.

As the economic power of the ruling class grows it becomes less useful in the life of the nation. All the useful work of the nation falls upon the shoulders of the class whose only property is its manual and mental labor power — the wage worker — or of the class who have but little land and little effective machinery outside of their labor power — the small traders and

small farmers. The ruling minority is steadily becoming useless and parasitic.

A bitter struggle over the division of the products of labor is waged between the exploiting propertied classes on the one hand and the exploited, propertyless class on the other. In this struggle the wage working class cannot expect adequate relief from any reform of the present order at the hands of the dominant class.

The wage workers are therefore the most determined and irreconcilable antagonists of the ruling class. They suffer most from the curse of class rule. The fact that a few capitalists are permitted to control all the country's industrial resources and social tools for their individual profit, and to make the production of the necessities of life the object of competitive private enterprise and speculation is at the bottom of all the social evils of our time.

In spite of the organization of trusts, pools and combinations, the capitalists are powerless to regulate production for social ends. Industries are largely conducted in a planless manner. Through periods of feverish activity the strength and health of the workers are mercilessly used up, and during periods of enforced idleness the workers are frequently reduced to starvation.

The climaxes of this system of production are the regularly recurring industrial depressions and crises which paralyze the nation every fifteen or twenty years.

The capitalist class, in its mad race for profits, is bound to exploit the workers to the very limit of their endurance and to sacrifice their physical, moral and mental welfare to its own insatiable greed. Capitalism keeps the masses of workingmen in poverty, destitution, physical exhaustion and ignorance. It drags their wives from their

homes to the mill and factory. It snatches their children from the playgrounds and schools and grinds their slender bodies and unformed minds into cold dollars. It disfigures, maims and kills hundreds of thousands of workingmen annually in mines, on railroads and in factories. It drives millions of workers into the ranks of the unemployed and forces large numbers of them into beggary, vagrancy and all forms of crime and vice.

To maintain their rule over their fellow men the capitalists must keep in their pay all organs of the public powers, public mind and public conscience. They control the dominant parties and, through them, the elected public officials. They select the executives, bribe the legislatures and corrupt the courts of justice. They own and censor the press. They dominate the educational institutions. They own the nation politically and intellectually just as they own it industrially.

The struggle between wage workers and capitalists grows ever fiercer, and has now become the only vital issue before the American people. The wage-working class, therefore, has the most direct interest in abolishing the capitalist system. But in abolishing the present system, the workingmen will free not only their own class, but also all other classes of modern society. The small farmer, who is today exploited by large capital more indirectly but not less effectively than is the wage laborer; the small manufacturer and trader, who is engaged in a desperate and losing struggle for economic independence in the face of the all-conquering power of concentrated capital; and even the capitalist himself, who is the slave of his wealth rather than its master. The struggle of the working class against the capitalist class, while it is a class struggle, is thus at the same time a struggle for the abolition of all classes and class privileges.

The private ownership of the land and means of production used for exploitation, is the rock upon which class rule is built; political government is its indispensable instrument. The wage-workers cannot be freed from exploitation without conquering the political power and substituting collective for private ownership of the land and means of production used for exploitation.

The basis for such transformation is rapidly developing within present capitalist society. The factory system, with its complex machinery and minute division of labor, is rapidly destroying all vestiges of individual production in manufacture. Modern production is already very largely a collective and social process. The great trusts and monopolies which have sprung up in recent years have organized the work and management of the principal industries on a national scale, and have fitted them for collective use and operation.

The Socialist Party is primarily an economic and political movement. It is not concerned with matters of religious belief.

In the struggle for freedom the interests of all modern workers are identical. The struggle is not only national, but international. It embraces the world and will be carried to ultimate victory by the united workers of the world.

To unite the workers of the nation and their allies and sympathizers of all other classes to this end, is the mission of the Socialist party. In this battle for freedom the Socialist party does not strive to substitute working class rule for capitalist class rule, but by working class victory, to free all humanity from class rule and to realize the international brotherhood of man.

PLATFORM FOR 1908.

The Socialist party, in national convention assembled, again declares itself as the party of the working class, and appeals for the support of all workers of the United States and of all citizens who sympathize with the great and just cause of labor.

We are at this moment in the midst of one of those industrial breakdowns that periodically paralyze the life of the nation. The much-boasted era of our national prosperity has been followed by one of general misery. Factories, mills and mines are closed. Millions of men, ready, willing and able to provide the nation with all the necessities and comforts of life are forced into idleness and starvation.

Within recent years the trust and monopolies have attained an enormous and menacing development. They have acquired the power to dictate the terms

upon which we shall be allowed to live. The trusts fix the prices of our bread, meat and sugar, of our coal, oil and clothing, of our raw material and machinery, of all the necessities of life.

The present desperate condition of the workers has been made the opportunity for a renewed onslaught on organized labor. The highest courts of the country have within the last year rendered decision after decision depriving the workers of rights which they had won by generations of struggle.

The attempt to destroy the Western Federation of Miners, although defeated by the solidarity of organized labor and the Socialist movement, revealed the existence of a far-reaching and unscrupulous conspiracy by the ruling class against the organization of labor.

In their efforts to take the lives of the leaders of the miners the conspirators violated state laws and the federal constitution in a manner seldom equaled even in a country so completely dominated by the profit-seeking class as is the United States.

The congress of the United States has shown its contempt for the interests of labor as plainly and unmistakably as have the other branches of government. The laws for which the labor organizations have continually petitioned have failed to pass. Laws ostensibly enacted for the benefit of labor have been distorted against labor.

The working class of the United States cannot expect any remedy for its wrongs from the present ruling class or from the dominant parties. So long as a small number of individuals are permitted to control the sources of the nation's wealth for their private profit in competition with each other and for the exploitation of their fellowmen, industrial depressions are bound to occur at certain intervals. No currency reforms or other legislative measures proposed by capitalist reformers can avail against these fatal results of utter anarchy in production.

Individually competition leads inevitably to combinations and trusts. No amount of government regulation, or of publicity, or of restrictive legislation will arrest the natural course of modern industrial development.

While our courts, legislatures and executive offices remain in the hands of the ruling classes and their agents, the government will be used in the inter-

ests of these classes as against the toilers.

Political parties are but the expression of economic class interests. The Republican, the Democratic, and the so-called "Independence" parties and all parties other than the Socialist party, are financed, directed and controlled by the representatives of different groups of the ruling class.

In the maintenance of class government both the Democratic and Republican parties have been equally guilty. The Republican party has had control of the national government and has been directly and actively responsible for these wrongs. The Democratic party, while saved from direct responsibility by its political impotence, has shown itself equally subservient to the aims of the capitalist class whenever and wherever it has been in power. The old chattel slave owning aristocracy of the south, which was the backbone of the Democratic party has been supplanted by a child slave plutocracy. In the great cities of our country the Democratic party is allied with the criminal element of the slums as the Republican party is allied with the predatory criminals of the palace in maintaining the interests of the possessing class.

The various "reform" movements and parties which have sprung up within recent years are but the clumsy expression of widespread popular discontent. They are not based on an intelligent understanding of the historical development of civilization and of the economic and political needs of our time. They are bound to perish as the numerous middle class reform movements of the past have perished.

PROGRAM.

As measures calculated to strengthen the working class in its fight for the realization of this ultimate aim, and to increase its power of resistance against capitalist oppression, we advocate and pledge ourselves and our elected officers to the following program:

General Demands.

1—The immediate government relief for the unemployed workers by building schools, by reforesting of cut-over and waste lands, by reclamation

of arid tracts, and the building of canals, and by extending all other useful public works. All persons employed on such works shall be employed directly by the government under an eight-hour work-day and at the prevailing union wages. The government shall also loan money to states and municipalities without interest for the purpose of carrying on public works. It shall contribute to the funds of labor organizations for the purpose of assisting their unemployed members, and shall take such other measures within its power as will lessen the widespread misery of the workers caused by the misrule of the capitalist class.

2—The collective ownership of railroads, telegraphs, telephones, steamship lines and all other means of social transportation and communication, and all land.

3—The collective ownership of all industries which are organized on a national scale and in which competition has virtually ceased to exist.

4—The extension of the public domain to include mines; quarries, oil wells, forests and water power.

5—The scientific reforestation of timber lands, and the reclamation of swamp lands. The land so reforested or reclaimed to be permanently retained as a part of the public domain.

6—The absolute freedom of press, speech and assemblage.

Industrial Demands.

7—The improvement of the industrial condition of the workers.

(a) By shortening the workday in keeping with the increased productivity of machinery.

(b) By securing to every worker a rest period of not less than a day and a half in each week.

(c) By securing a more effective inspection of workshops and factories.

(d) By forbidding the employment of children under sixteen years of age.

(e) By forbidding the interstate transportation of the products of

child labor, of convict labor and of all uninspected factories.

(f) By abolishing official charity and substituting in its place compulsory insurance against unemployment, illness, accident, invalidism, old age and death.

Political Demands.

8—The extension of inheritance taxes, graduated in proportion to the amount of the bequests and to the nearness of kin.

9—A graduated income tax.

10—Unrestricted and equal suffrage for men and women, and we pledge ourselves to engage in an active campaign in that direction.

11—The initiative and referendum, proportional representation and the right of recall.

12—The abolition of the senate.

13—The abolition of the power usurped by the supreme court of the United States to pass upon the constitutionality of legislation enacted by Congress. National laws to be repealed or abrogated only by act of Congress or by a referendum of the whole people.

14—That the constitution be made amendable by majority vote.

15—The enactment of further measures for general education and for the conservation of health. The bureau of education to be made a department. The creation of a department of public health.

16—The separation of the present bureau of labor from the department of commerce and labor, and the establishment of a department of labor.

17—That all judges be elected by the people for short terms, and that the power to issue injunctions shall be curbed by immediate legislation.

18—The free administration of justice.

Such measures of relief as we may be able to force from capitalism are but a preparation of the workers to seize the whole power of government, in order that they may thereby lay hold of the whole system of industry and thus come to their rightful inheritance.

CONSTITUTION AS AMENDED.

ARTICLE I.

Name.

Sec. 1. The name of this organization shall be the Socialist Party, except in such states where a different name has or may become a legal requirement.

ARTICLE II.

Membership.

Sec. 1. Every person, resident of the United States of the age of eighteen years and upward, without discrimination as to sex, race, color or creed, who has severed his connection with all other political parties, and subscribes to the principles of the Socialist Party, including political action, shall be eligible to membership in the Party.

Sec. 2. Any person occupying a position, honorary or remunerative, by gift of any party other than the Socialist Party (civil service positions excepted), shall not be eligible to membership in the Socialist Party.

Sec. 3. A member who desires to transfer his membership from the party in one state to the party in another state may do so upon the presentation of his card showing him to be in good standing at the time of asking for such transfer.

Sec. 4. No member of the party, in any state or territory, shall under any pretext, interfere with the regular or organized movement in any other state.

Sec. 5. All persons joining the Socialist Party shall sign the following pledge: "I, the undersigned, recognizing the class struggle between the capitalist class and the working class and the necessity of the working class constituting themselves into a political party distinct from and opposed to all parties formed by the propertied classes, hereby declare that I have severed my relations with all other parties, that I endorse the platform and constitution of the Socialist Party, including the

principle of political action, and hereby apply for admission to said party."

Sec. 6. Any member of the party who opposes political action as a weapon of the working class to aid in its emancipation shall be expelled from membership in the party.

ARTICLE III.

Management.

Sec. 1. The affairs of the Socialist Party shall be administered by a National Committee, its officers and executive Committee, the party conventions, and the general vote of the party.

Sec. 2. Three years' consecutive membership in the party shall be necessary to qualify for all national official positions.

ARTICLE IV.

National Committee.

Sec. 1. Each organized state or territory shall be represented on the National Committee by one member and by an additional member for every two thousand members or major fraction thereof in good standing in the party. For the purpose of determining the representation to which each state or territory may be entitled, the National Secretary shall compute at the beginning of each year the average dues-paying membership of such state or territory for the preceding year.

Sec. 2. The members of this committee shall be elected by referendum vote of and from the membership of the states or territories which they respectively represent. Their term of office shall not be more than two years. The members of the National Committee shall be subject to removal by referendum vote of their respective states.

Sec. 3. The National Committee shall meet whenever it shall deem it necessary to do so.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the National

Committeemen in attending meetings shall be paid from the National Treasury.

Sec. 5. No motion shall be submitted to a referendum of the National Committee by correspondence unless supported within thirty days by not less than five members of the National Committee from three different states.

Sec. 6. The National Committee shall adopt its own rules of procedure not inconsistent with the provisions of this constitution.

ARTICLE V.

Duties and Powers of the National Committee.

Sec. 1. The duties of this committee shall be to represent the party in all national and international affairs; to call national nominating conventions and special conventions decided upon by the referendum of the party; to make reports to national conventions, and to receive and pass upon all reports and actions of the Executive Committee.

Sec. 2. The National Committee shall neither publish nor designate any official organ.

ARTICLE VI.

National Executive Committee.

Sec. 1. The National Executive Committee shall be composed of seven members, elected by the National Committee from the membership of the party, and they shall hold office for two years. The call for nominations and elections shall be issued in the month of November of even numbered years.

Sec. 2. The duties of the National Executive Committee shall be to supervise and direct the work of the National Secretary; to organize unorganized states and territories; to receive and pass upon the reports of the National Secretary, and to transact all current business of the national office, except such as is by this constitution expressly reserved for the National Committee or the general vote of the party. The National Executive Committee shall also formulate the rules and order of business of the national conventions of the party not otherwise provided for by this constitution, subject to adoption or amendment by the conventions.

Sec. 3. The Executive Committee shall adopt its own rules of procedure not inconsistent with this constitution or with the rules of the National Committee.

Sec. 4. The Executive Committee shall transmit copies of the minutes of its meetings to all members of the National Committee, and all its acts and resolutions shall be subject to the revision of the National Committee.

Sec. 5. The National Executive Committee shall meet whenever it shall deem it necessary to do so. Between sessions all its business shall be transacted by correspondence.

ARTICLE VII.

National Secretary.

Sec. 1. The National Secretary shall be elected by the National Committee and shall hold office for two years. The call for nominations and election shall be conducted at the same time and the same manner as that of the National Executive Committee. Vacancies shall be filled in a similar manner. The National Secretary shall receive as compensation the sum of Fifteen Hundred Dollars annually and shall give a bond in a sum fixed by National Executive Committee.

Sec. 2. The National Secretary shall have charge of all affairs of the National office subject to the directions of the Executive Committee, and the National Committee. He shall receive the reports of the state organizations and of the local organizations in unorganized states and territories. He shall supervise the accounts of the national office, and the work of the lecture bureau, the literature bureau and such other departments as may hereafter be established in connection with the national office.

Sec. 3. The National Secretary shall issue to all party organizations, in such way as the Executive Committee may direct, monthly bulletins containing a report of the financial affairs of the party, a summary of the conditions and the membership of the several state and territorial organizations, the principal business transacted by his office, and such other matters pertaining to the organization and activity of the party, as may be of general interest to the membership. Such bulletins shall not contain editorial comment.

Sec. 4. The National Secretary shall be empowered to secure such help as may be necessary for the proper transaction of the business of his office.

Sec. 5. The National Secretary may be recalled at any time by the National Committee or membership.

ARTICLE VIII.

The Lecture Bureau.

Sec. 1. There shall be maintained in connection with the national office a Lecture Bureau for the purpose of arranging tours for lecturers for the propaganda of Socialism.

Sec. 2. The Lecture Bureau shall have the right to make arrangements for the lecturers under its auspices with all state organizations of the party.

Sec. 3. The National Committee shall establish a uniform rate of compensation for all lecturers and organizers working under its auspices.

ARTICLE IX.

The Literature Bureau.

Sec. 1. The National Committee shall also maintain in the headquarters of the party a department for the dissemination of Socialist literature.

Sec. 2. The Literature Bureau shall keep for sale to the local organizations of the party and others, a stock of Socialist books, pamphlets and other literature, and shall have the right, with the approval of the committee, to publish works on Socialism or for the purpose of Socialist propaganda, but this clause shall not be construed as authorizing the bureau to publish any periodical.

Sec. 3. The profits of the Literature Bureau shall go into the general funds of the party treasury.

ARTICLE X.

Conventions.

Sec. 1. The regular national nominating convention of the party shall be held in all years in which elections for President and Vice President of the United States are to be held.

Sec. 2. A congress of the party to consider and report upon the program, agitation and organization of the party shall be held in each even numbered year, when there is no national nominating convention. The order of business of the congress shall be prepared by the National Executive Committee, subject to the approval of the congress. The basis of representation shall be one delegate at large and one delegate for every five hundred members. Delegates shall be elected and accredited otherwise as for a nominating convention.

Sec. 3. Special conventions of the party may be held at any time if decid-

ed upon by a general vote of the party membership.

Sec. 4. The dates and places of holding such regular or special conventions shall be fixed by the National Committee.

Sec. 5. The basis of representation in any national nominating convention shall be by states, each state and territory being entitled to one delegate at large, and one additional delegate for every four hundred members, or majority fraction thereof above the first 400, in good standing; provided, however, that no delegate shall be considered eligible unless he is a resident of the state from which the credential is presented, and shall have been a member of the party for at least two years.

Sec. 6. Railroad fare of the delegates, going to and coming from the convention and the congresses of the party shall be paid from the national treasury, and such expenses shall be raised by a per capita assessment on the entire membership.

Sec. 7. The election of delegates to the National Conventions shall take place not later than sixty days preceding the National Convention and the respective State Secretaries shall furnish the National Secretary not later than thirty days preceding such convention with a list of the accredited delegates to the convention.

The National Secretary shall prepare a printed roster of the accredited delegates to be sent to each delegate and forwarded to the party press for publication. That such list shall contain the occupation of each delegate and his office or employment in the party. That all official reports required to be presented to the National Convention shall be printed and sent to each delegate elected at least fifteen days before the date of the conventions and furnished to the party press for publication. At the time and place set for the opening of the National Convention the National Secretary shall call the convention to order, and shall call the roll to ascertain the number of uncontested delegates, and they shall permanently organize the convention.

The following order of business shall be observed:

1. Election of Chairman for the day.
2. Election of Secretary, Reading Clerk and Sergeant-at-Arms.

ARTICLE XII.

State Organizations.

Sec. 1. The formation of all state or territorial organizations or the reorganization of state or territorial organizations which may have lapsed shall be under the direction of the Executive Committee, and in conformity with the rules of the National Committee.

Sec. 2. No state or territory may be organized unless it has at least ten locals or an aggregate membership of not less than two hundred; but this provision shall not affect the rights of states and territories organized prior to the adoption of this constitution. When the membership of any state averages less than 150 per month for any six consecutive months, the National Committee may revoke the charter of that state.

Sec. 3. The platform of the Socialist Party shall be the supreme declaration of the party, and all state and municipal platforms shall conform thereto; and no state or local organization shall under any circumstances fuse, combine or compromise with any other political party or organization, or refrain from making nominations, in order to favor the candidate of such other organizations, nor shall any candidate of the Socialist Party accept any nomination or endorsement from any other party or political organization.

Sec. 4. In states and territories in which there is one central organization affiliated with the party, the state or territorial organizations shall have the sole jurisdiction of the members residing within their respective territories, and the sole control of all matters pertaining to the propaganda, organization and financial affairs within such state or territory; their activity shall be confined to their respective organizations, and the National Committee and subcommittees or officers thereof shall have no right to interfere in such matters without the consent of the respective state or territorial organizations.

Sec. 5. The State Committees shall make monthly reports to the National Secretary concerning their membership, financial condition and general standing of the party.

Sec. 6. The State Committee shall pay to National Committee every month a sum equal to five cents for every mem-

3. Nomination of the following Regular Committees:

Contested Seats—7 members.

Platform—9 members.

Constitution—9 members.

Resolutions—9 members.

Ways and Means—9 members.

Reports of National Officers—7 members.

International Relations—5 members.

After opportunity for declinations the complete list of nominations above provided for shall be printed at once in ballot form.

4. Report of Committee on Rules, appointed by the National Executive Committee.

ARTICLE XI.

Referendum.

Sec. 1. Motions to amend any part of this constitution, as well as any other motions or resolutions to be voted upon by the entire membership of the party, shall be submitted by the National Secretary to a referendum of the party membership, upon the request of twenty local organizations, in five or more states or territories, or any smaller number of local organizations in three states having two thousand members in the aggregate; provided, however, that the required number of requests for such a referendum shall all have been made within a period of ninety consecutive days.

Sec. 2. Whenever a request for a referendum shall have been made as above provided, the National Secretary shall forthwith cause the same to be published in the party press, and shall allow such question to stand open for thirty days, within which time amendments may be offered thereto in the same manner in which an original request for a referendum is to be made, and at the close of the said period of thirty days the original motion submitted to referendum, together with all and any amendments which may have been offered, shall be submitted to the vote of the party members, and such vote shall close fifty days thereafter.

Sec. 3. All propositions or other matters submitted for the referendum of the party shall be presented without preamble or comment.

ber in good standing within their respective territories.

Sec. 7. All state organizations shall provide in their constitutions for the initiative, referendum and imperative mandate.

Sec. 8. No person shall be nominated or endorsed by any subdivision of the party for candidate unless he is a member of the party, and has been such for at least one year, but this provision shall not apply to organizations which have been in existence for less than one year.

Sec. 9. In case of controversy in any state as to the validity of the title of its officers and the question of recognition by the national organization, a referendum of the membership of said state to determine the question may be taken in the following manner:

A call signed by not less than one-third of the total membership of the state in good standing at the time the controversy arose, asking the National Executive Committee to conduct a referendum of the said state membership for the election of officers for the position in dispute, shall be filed with the National Secretary.

Upon receiving such call the National Executive Committee shall conduct a referendum of the membership of said state for the election of officers for the position in dispute. All locals appearing on the state list at the National headquarters in good standing at the time the controversy arose shall be privileged to make nominations, and all members in good standing at that time shall be entitled to vote.

Sec. 10. The National Executive Committee may appoint secretaries to reside in the unorganized states, who shall be selected as far as possible from the section in which the state is located. A salary not to exceed \$18.00 per week shall be allowed them, and they shall have complete charge of organization in their respective states. They shall hold office subject to the National Executive

Committee, provided that when there are not less than ten (10) locals or two hundred (200) members in good standing in any state, a state organization may be formed, which shall then elect its own officers.

Sec. 11. The National Executive Committee is authorized to give financial assistance from the national organization to any state organization applying for same, and having a membership of less than 1,200, to enable the Secretary of said state to secure a living wage while giving his entire time to the work of organizing the state.

ARTICLE XIII.

Headquarters.

Sec. 1. The location of the headquarters of the party shall be determined by the National Committee.

ARTICLE XIV.

International Delegates.

Sec. 1. Delegates to the International Congress shall be elected by referendum in the year when the congress is held; one delegate for every five thousand members, and their expenses shall be paid out of the treasury of the national party.

ARTICLE XV.

Amendments.

Sec. 1. This constitution may be amended by a national convention or by a referendum of the party in the manner above provided. But all amendments made by a national convention shall be submitted seriatim to a referendum vote of the party membership.

ARTICLE XVI.

Time and Method of Taking Effect.

Sec. 1. This constitution shall take effect and be in force on the first day of January after the time of its approval by national referendum of the party membership.

INDEX.

A

Abolition of Senate—166, 212.
Adams, Wm.—18, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.
Ambrose, Geo. H.—17, 40, 61, 62, 161, 164, 223, 254, 290.
Amendment of U. S. Constitution—166, 212.
American Federation of Labor—96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 102, 110, 154.
Anderson, A. S.—17, 61, 159, 160, 164, 219, 223, 254, 290, 317.
Anderson, Jules J.—17, 61, 144, 160, 164, 223, 232, 233, 243, 254.
Arnstein, Louis—8, 17, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.
Assistant Secretaries—9, 10, 40, 221.
Atwood, E. Francis—14, 18, 61, 161, 164, 223, 254.
Auditing Committee—
Provision for—10, 11.
Nomination of—41.
Election of—62.
Report of—308.

B

Bandlow, Robert—17, 61, 62, 160, 161, 164, 165, 201, 223, 254, 302, 303.
Bannell, John—17.
Barnes, J. Mahlon—7, 18, 23, 35, 36, 37, 38, 42, 58, 71, 72, 92, 158, 199, 200, 258, 261, 269, 276, 283, 284, 296, 298, 313, 318.
Barzee, C. W.—16, 18, 61, 62, 160, 164, 179, 183, 223, 241, 244, 254, 312.
Bassett, Arthur—17, 34, 254.
Bauer, Kasper—16, 22, 24, 61, 62, 127, 160, 164, 188, 219, 223, 242, 243, 254.
Behrens, E. T.—17, 61, 161, 164, 223, 244.
Bell, W. J.—18, 61, 62, 160, 164, 223, 254, 255, 256.
Bentall, J. O.—17, 40, 61, 62, 161, 164, 201, 223, 254.
Berger, Victor L.—8, 13, 15, 18, 28, 37, 41, 49, 50, 58, 59, 61, 62, 111, 113, 119, 127, 131, 143, 144, 145, 152, 157, 161, 164, 183, 185, 201, 203, 205, 223,

227, 228, 229, 240, 241, 242, 254, 264, 265, 269, 270, 274, 278, 281, 292, 294, 297, 298, 299, 300, 313, 318, 319.
Berlyn, Barney—11, 12, 16, 17, 22, 29, 45, 61, 62, 113, 115, 161, 164, 223, 237, 251, 254, 260, 261, 283, 284, 289, 310.
Bigelow, George E.—62, 91.
Bigelow, Mrs. George E.—62.
Bigelow, Sarah A.—62, 91.
Bills and Ordinances—73.
Block, Carrie C.—16, 18, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.
Boomer, George E.—8, 16, 18, 34, 35, 47, 49, 56, 62, 139, 140, 161, 164, 186, 223, 235, 254, 308.
Boylan, C. B.—8, 18, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.
Bradford, W. S.—16, 61, 139, 160, 164, 223, 235, 240, 243, 254, 307, 308.
Brandt, Wm. M.—17, 24, 61, 62, 74, 81, 161, 164, 223, 254, 310.
Branstetter, O. F.—11, 18, 41, 61, 143, 145, 158, 160, 164, 223, 230, 231, 232, 254, 276, 277.
Branstetter, Winnie E.—18, 61, 62, 78, 164, 211, 223, 254, 301, 306.
Brewer, Grace D.—17, 61, 62, 162, 164, 223, 254, 301.
Brower, James H.—14, 17, 61, 71, 74, 78, 139, 146, 151, 152, 161, 164, 206, 221, 223, 254.
Brown, E. J.—18, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 54, 57, 60, 71, 161, 164, 196, 223, 225, 226, 254.
Brown, Margaret M.—17, 61, 161, 164, 223, 254.
Buchanan, W. W.—18, 61, 62, 160, 164, 223, 254, 308.
Buie, T. L.—16, 61, 62, 160, 164, 223, 254, 310.

C

Callery, P. H.—17, 61, 146, 160, 164, 223, 254.
Campaign Fund—309.
Candidates, State and Local—73.

- Cannon, Joseph D.—16, 31, 61, 160, 164, 175, 186, 206, 207, 210, 223, 230, 231, 254.
- Carey, James F.—17, 23, 41, 42, 61, 134, 155, 156, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 180, 182, 183, 194, 195, 223, 254.
- Carr, E. E.—61, 87, 125, 158, 160, 161, 164, 201, 223, 247, 254, 269, 270, 273, 277, 286, 294, 313, 319.
- Chairmen of Convention—9, 10, 19, 23, 43, 64, 93, 165, 221, 258.
- Charity, Official—165, 211.
- Chenoweth, John—17, 37, 61, 161, 164, 223, 254.
- Child Labor—165, 206, 211.
- Clark, Sam—18, 61, 160, 164, 208, 223, 254.
- Clark, Stanley J.—8, 16, 18, 30, 35, 39, 41, 61, 93, 103, 125, 160, 164, 167, 168, 169, 175, 179, 184, 186, 187, 188, 204, 222, 223, 246, 247, 248, 253, 254.
- Cohen, George N.—18, 60, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.
- Cohen, Joseph E.—18, 32, 60, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.
- Cole, Josephine R.—16, 26, 45, 47, 61, 62, 72, 120, 160, 164, 175, 186, 211, 223, 254, 265, 301, 305, 312.
- Cole, W. E.—17, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.
- Collective Ownership—165, 167, 175, 186.
- Collins, John—17, 40, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.
- Commission Government Committee—
Provision for—33.
Nomination of—43.
Election of—62.
Report of—310.
Debate on Report of—312.
- Committees—
Auditing—10, 11, 41, 62, 308.
Constitution—10, 11, 41, 62, 230-257, 260-300.
Credentials—8, 9, 16-19, 21, 34.
Editing Platform—146, 229.
Farmers' Program—10, 13-16, 20-22, 41, 62, 91, 178-186.
Farmers' Program, Permanent—91, 186, 246, 312.
Foreign Speaking Organizations—10, 22, 41, 62, 313.
Government by Commission—33, 43, 62, 310.
Immigration, Permanent—105, 122, 246, 312.
Labor Organizations—25-33, 41, 43, 62, 93-102.
Platform—10, 11, 40, 41, 135-146, 165-176, 186, 300, 306.
Platform, Elected by National Committee—11.
- Press—10, 11, 41, 62, 306-308.
- Resolutions—10, 11, 62, 73-91, 103-135, 178.
- Rules, Elected by National Committee—9, 10-16, 19, 20-22, 25-33.
- Ways and Means—10, 11, 40, 41, 62, 308.
- Women and Their Relationship to the Socialist Party—10, 11, 41, 62, 300-306.
- Women's, Permanent—301, 306.
- Communications—8, 22, 42, 43, 61, 62, 63, 64, 79, 93, 177.
- Constitutionality of Laws—226.
- Constitution Committee—
Provision for—10, 11.
Nomination of—41.
Election of—62.
Report of—230-257, 260-300.
Minority Reports of—246, 255, 256, 283.
- Convict Labor—165, 211.
- Cowan, Isaac—17, 43, 61, 62, 83, 160, 164, 205, 223, 254, 260, 286, 300.
- Crabtree, Mrs. Mollie—18, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.
- Credentials Committee—
Provision for—8.
Nomination of—8.
Election of—9.
Report of—16-19, 21, 34.
Minority Reports of—34.
- Cutting, George G.—17, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.

D

- Davies, Edwin H.—18, 48, 59, 60, 61, 160, 164, 223, 245, 254.
- Davis, G. W.—18, 61, 62, 164, 223, 254, 310.
- Debs, Eugene V.—8, 17, 22, 127, 129, 135, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 167, 177, 178.
- Dennett, A. H.—18, 61, 72, 161, 164, 223, 254.
- Department of Education—166, 212.
- Department of Health—166, 212.
- Department of Labor—166, 212.
- Devine, Thomas C.—61, 160, 164, 197, 223, 254, 260.
- Dome, C. H.—18, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.
- D'Orsay, Harriet—17, 61, 62, 141, 160, 164, 192, 223, 254, 286, 310, 319.
- Downie, John—18, 161, 164, 185, 223, 254, 277.
- Drury, E. A.—21, 260.
- Dunbar, Robert—17, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.

E

- Editing Platform Committee—
Provision for—146, 229.
Election of—229.
- Edwards, L. S.—15, 18, 61, 116, 160, 164, 223, 254.

F

- Factory Inspection—165, 206, 211.
- Farmers' Committee—
Provision for—10, 13-16, 20-22.
Nomination of—41.
Election of—62.
Reports of—91, 178.
Minority Report of—179.
Debate on Reports of—179-186.
- Farmers' Committee, Permanent—
Provision for—91.
Nomination of—186.
Election of—246, 312.
- Farrell, D. P.—17, 31, 61, 71, 96, 178, 191, 195, 223, 238, 246, 253, 254, 271, 272, 274, 275, 278, 285, 299, 300, 306, 319.
- Fenton, Alva E.—17, 61, 62, 160, 164, 223, 254.
- Fieldman, Sol.—17, 47, 48, 61, 62, 80, 86, 119, 160, 164, 166, 167, 171, 174, 188, 213, 214, 215, 218, 223, 234, 254, 260, 281, 287, 289, 297, 301, 304, 305.
- Finnish Translator, Report of—70, 314-317.
Action on—314.
Reconsidered—319.
- Floaten, L. E.—16, 40, 61, 161, 164, 223, 254.
- Foley, Con F.—18, 61, 160, 164, 123, 254.
- Foreign Speaking Organizations Committee—
Provision for—10, 22.
Nomination of—41.
Election of—62.
Report of—313.
Debate on Report of—313, 314.
- Fraenckel, G. T.—11, 17, 42, 61, 79, 160, 164, 223, 224, 254, 275, 313.
- Fraternal Delegates from Canada—21, 230, 258.
- Freedom of Assemblage—165, 191.
- Freedom of Press—165, 191.
- Freedom of Speech—165, 191.
- Freeman, Thomas N.—14, 16, 61, 160, 163, 164, 223, 254.
- Fuhrman, W. F.—17, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.
- Furman, C. L.—17, 61, 131, 132, 145, 160, 164, 167, 174, 176, 186, 223, 224, 254, 263, 271, 289, 290.

G

- Garver, William L.—17, 61, 62, 160, 164, 223, 254, 308.
- Gaylord, Winfield R.—8, 16, 18, 36, 37, 39, 61, 62, 157, 159, 161, 164, 190, 192, 223, 230, 232, 233, 236, 244, 245, 246, 252, 254, 255, 256, 258, 260, 261, 262, 263, 265, 269, 270, 273, 275, 276, 277, 278, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 292, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 313, 314.
- Gerber, Julius—17, 40, 61, 62, 99, 160, 164, 165, 223, 231, 234, 235, 244, 246, 254, 271, 283, 308, 310.
- Goaziou, Louis—18, 62, 160, 164, 209, 212, 223, 226, 241, 313.
- Goebel, George H.—9, 17, 25, 38, 44, 46, 48, 50, 54, 55, 57, 58, 59, 61, 133, 134, 153, 160, 164, 223, 226, 244, 251, 254, 256, 266, 268, 269, 280, 299, 305, 318.
- Graham, James D.—8, 16, 17, 61, 62, 161, 162, 164, 223, 254.
- Groesbeck, H. V.—18, 61, 161, 164, 223, 254, 278, 301.

H

- Hagel, John—17, 33, 61, 62, 122, 138, 139, 160, 164, 223, 234, 244, 254, 272, 277, 278.
- Hanford, Benjamin—17, 61, 87, 126, 128, 130, 132, 134, 151, 160, 161, 163, 164, 177, 223, 254, 305.
- Harvey, Arthur T.—17, 61, 161, 164, 223, 254.
- Hayes, Max S.—61, 100, 120, 121, 122, 159, 160, 164, 223, 254.
- Hazlett, Ida Crouch—17, 27, 61, 62, 155, 160, 161, 164, 173, 223, 233, 236, 237, 238, 240, 242, 243, 244, 254, 263.
- Heath, Frederic—8, 18, 19, 61, 161, 164, 167, 177, 221, 223, 254, 258.
- Henck, Frank A.—18, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254, 276, 277.
- Hendrickson, Emil—161, 223, 254.
- Herman, Emil—18, 24, 49, 51, 53, 55, 57, 59, 109, 122, 161, 164, 170, 200, 223, 246, 254, 292, 293, 294, 300, 307, 312.
- Hillquit, Morris—7, 9, 17, 23, 24, 41, 49, 50, 61, 64, 66, 67, 71, 85, 88, 91, 131, 132, 138, 143, 145, 146, 160, 161, 164, 187, 188, 189, 193, 195, 201, 205, 211, 213, 214, 217, 218, 219, 223, 225, 229, 254.
- Hills, W. C.—17, 33, 61, 62, 76, 160, 164, 223, 254, 310, 311, 312.
- Hitchcock, C. C.—17, 61, 161, 164, 223, 254.
- Hittunen, Tom—17, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254, 313.

Hoehn, G. A.—9, 13, 17, 24, 48, 49, 61, 62, 73, 74, 77, 86, 87, 89, 90, 104, 105, 107, 111, 159, 161, 164, 170, 191, 223, 254.
 Hogan, Dan—16, 61, 99, 137, 141, 160, 164, 223, 231, 234, 236, 254.
 Holman, H. L. A.—18, 61, 74, 121, 122, 135, 137, 160, 163, 164, 207, 223, 254, 312.
 Houston, H. W.—18, 61, 161, 164, 223, 254.
 Hunt, Gertrude Breslau—17, 61, 62, 161, 223, 254, 270, 301.
 Hunter, Robert—17, 61, 99, 100, 140, 141, 161, 164, 198, 199, 223, 254.
 Hurst, Fred—18, 61, 164, 166, 216, 217, 218, 223, 254, 276, 277.
 Hutcheson, A.—39, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59.
 Hymes, Alexander—17, 61, 161, 164, 223, 254.

I

Immigration Committee, Permanent—
 Provision for—105.
 Nomination of—122.
 Election of—246, 312.
 Income Tax—165, 211.
 Ingalls, James S.—17, 19, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254, 280, 282, 298, 299.
 Inheritance Tax—165, 211.
 Initiative and Referendum—165, 212, 289.
 Injunctions—166, 213.
 Insurance against Accidents, etc—165, 211.
 International Congress, Delegates to—
 249, 296.
 International Secretary—
 Report of—64-66.
 Election of—10, 25, 229.
 Interstate Transportation—165, 211.

J

Jacobs, W. A.—18, 61, 62, 161, 164, 223, 254, 284, 285, 307.
 Johns, Cloudsley—16, 61, 82, 104, 160, 164, 167, 206, 223, 226, 254, 268, 269.
 Jones, Ellis O.—17, 61, 62, 160, 163, 164, 223, 254.
 Jones, J. Sam—16, 61, 84, 161, 223, 254.
 Judges for Convention—9, 40.
 Judges of Courts—166, 213.
 Justice, Free Administration of—166, 213.

K

Kaplan, M.—17, 61, 62, 86, 88, 95, 123, 124, 130, 134, 135, 158, 159, 160, 164, 185, 223, 254, 277.

Katterfeld, Ludwig E.—17, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.
 Kearns, H. R.—17, 61, 66, 77, 90, 92, 96, 98, 123, 160, 164, 223, 254, 256, 285, 286.
 Kerr, Charles H.—17, 61, 62, 124, 160, 164, 223, 236, 254, 271, 295.
 Killingbeck, W. B.—10, 17, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254, 278.
 Klenke, August—17, 61, 71, 160, 164, 223, 254.
 Knopfnagel, S. A.—17, 62, 115, 160, 164, 183, 202, 223, 247, 254, 313.
 Knowles, Freeman—18, 61, 161, 164, 223, 254.
 Konikow, Antoinette—17, 61, 62, 79, 164, 208, 223, 254, 265, 274, 301, 302, 303, 304, 306.
 Korngold, Ralph—98, 160, 163, 164, 171, 207, 208, 223, 225, 254, 278, 298, 307.
 Krafft, Fred—17, 19, 49, 61, 62, 161, 164, 223, 232, 254, 283.
 Krueger, Richard—18, 50, 51, 138, 161, 164, 223, 254.
 Kunath, Otto—17, 61, 160, 164, 223, 236, 245, 254, 291.

L

Labor Organizations Committee—
 Provision for—25-33.
 Nomination of—41, 43.
 Election of—62.
 Report of—93-95.
 Debate on Report of—95-102.
 Lampman, J. S.—34, 61, 160, 164, 223.
 Lee, Algernon—12, 17, 27, 30, 32, 61, 62, 93, 95, 102, 160, 164, 184, 223, 229, 254, 264, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 279, 312.
 Le Fevre, Wells—16, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.
 Leggett, Robert—18, 61, 161, 164, 223, 254.
 Length of Speeches—8, 10, 22, 92.
 Letter to President of U. S.—9, 73-90.
 Lewis, Arthur Morrow—17, 44, 46, 47, 76, 77, 87, 88, 90, 107, 109, 110, 112, 113, 117, 140, 146, 161, 162, 164, 191, 193, 194, 195, 198, 201, 202, 205, 206, 223.
 Lewis, H. Claude—17, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.
 Lewis, Thomas J.—17, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.
 Lipscomb, Caleb—17, 61, 62, 161, 162, 164, 223, 254, 256.
 Liquor Question—90, 317, 319.
 Lockwood, Guy H.—17, 61, 128, 129, 161, 164, 223, 254, 318.

M.

Maattala, J. G.—17, 61, 161, 164, 223, 254.
 Macki, John—17, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.
 Mahoney, Patrick—17, 61, 71, 160, 163, 164, 223, 254.
 Majority Rule—166, 212.
 Mance, A. W.—21, 258.
 Martin, E. E.—161, 164, 223, 254.
 Maurer, James H.—18, 61, 62, 160, 164, 223, 254.
 Maynard, Mila Tupper—16, 61, 62, 141, 160, 164, 192, 193, 223, 229, 254, 301, 306.
 McAllister, A. S.—17, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.
 McDewitt, William—16, 18, 19, 61, 71, 98, 100, 160, 164, 223, 232, 233, 254, 282, 306, 314.
 McKee, Harry M.—16, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.
 Melms, E. T.—18, 61, 161, 164, 223, 254.
 Menton, Etta—17, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.
 Metcalf, W. P.—18, 61, 161, 164, 223, 254.
 Mileage of Delegates—70, 71-73, 92, 283, 300.
 Miller, A. Grant—18, 26, 46, 47, 48, 49, 55, 61, 62, 113, 115, 160, 164, 223, 237, 245, 254, 295.
 Minority Reports—
 On Delegates Mileage—283.
 On Farmers' Program—179.
 On Manner of Electing Executive Committee—246, 255.
 On Manner of Electing National Secretary—256.
 On National Committee Motions—246.
 On Nebraska Case—34.
 On Unity Question—123.
 On Washington Case—34.
 On Women's Relationship to the Party—301, 302.
 McFadin, Alice—18, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.
 Merrill, Mary F.—16, 61, 98, 160, 164, 223, 254.
 Miller, Guy E.—16, 23, 24, 25, 40, 41, 61, 73, 106, 107, 109, 111, 160, 162, 164, 210, 223, 254, 313.
 Moore, Edward—18, 26, 61, 62, 123, 160, 164, 208, 209, 223, 254.
 Morgan, Thomas J.—8, 12, 17, 30, 40, 51, 62, 160, 164, 222, 223, 225, 226, 229, 230, 231, 234, 236, 237, 242, 254, 260, 261, 300.
 Morrison, J. M.—16, 61, 160, 164, 184, 210, 223, 254.

N.

National Congress—262-272, 280, 281, 288.
 National Committee—7, 8, 11, 262, 263, 265, 266, 267, 276, 281, 289, 291, 296, 297, 299, 301, 303, 305, 306, 309, 319.
 National Constitution as Adopted—325.
 National Convention—262-272, 280, 281, 282-288, 296.
 National Executive Committee—
 Report on Washington Case—43.
 How Elected—246-255.
 Duties of—255.
 Miscellaneous—34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 67, 68, 73, 103, 123, 124, 178, 260, 261, 276, 285, 286, 288, 291, 292, 295, 296, 298, 299, 300, 305, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 318, 319.
 National Platform as Adopted—320.
 National Secretary—
 Voice but No Vote—10, 25.
 Report of—67-71.
 How Elected—256, 260.
 Duties of—261.
 Bond of—256, 260, 261, 299, 300.
 Compensation of—256, 260.
 May Be Recalled—261.
 Nebraska Case—
 Credential Committee's Reports on—18, 34.
 National Secretary's Report on—68.
 Ways and Means Committee's Report on—310.
 Nieminen, Ester—17, 61, 62, 114, 161, 164, 223, 254, 313.
 Nomination of Candidate for President—10, 25, 40, 146-161.
 Nomination of Candidate for Vice-President—10, 25, 40, 161-164.

O.

O'Hare, Frank P.—18, 21, 40, 61, 91, 137, 138, 143, 150, 159, 160, 164, 182, 223, 254, 271, 272, 281, 287, 295, 298.
 O'Neill, W. L.—18, 61, 103, 161, 164, 223, 254, 273.
 Ordinances and Bills—73.
 Organization—40.
 Osborne, J. B.—8, 14, 16, 18, 19, 32, 33, 37, 40, 61, 97, 160, 164, 221, 223, 237, 254, 256, 260, 289, 296.

P.

Paulitsch, Fred—17, 40, 61, 117, 160, 164, 223, 254, 270, 285, 307.
 Payne, Laura B.—18, 61, 62, 83, 84, 160, 164, 181, 223, 241, 254, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 312.

Peach, Thomas J.—17, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.
 Peiser, Mark—17, 61, 62, 72, 98, 112, 160, 164, 254, 308.
 Pelsey, Willis E.—17, 61, 161, 164, 223, 254.
 Penrose, William—16, 40, 61, 160, 164, 223.
 Perrin, E. W.—16, 61, 62, 160, 164, 223, 254.
 Pettigrew, A. J.—16, 61, 161, 164, 223, 254.
 Peura, John—61, 161, 164, 223, 254.
 Photograph of Delegates—63.
 Platform Committee—
 Provision for—10, 11.
 Nomination of—40.
 Election of—40, 41.
 Report of—135, 141, 165-167, 186.
 Debates on Report of—137-141, 142-146, 165-176, 186-228.
 Platform Committee Elected by National Committee—
 Report of Referred—11.
 Pope, Leander G.—12, 17, 26, 61, 88, 149, 160, 161, 164, 218, 223, 234, 254, 265, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 278, 286, 289, 308, 310.
 Porter, G. C.—18, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 61, 161, 164, 223, 224, 254, 290.
 Powers, John—17, 61, 161, 164, 223, 254.
 Press Committee—
 Provision for—10, 11.
 Nomination of—41.
 Election of—62.
 Report of—306.
 Debate on Report of—307, 308.
 Prevey, Marguerite—17, 61, 62, 97, 140, 160, 164, 206, 207, 223, 239, 247, 254, 301, 306.
 Proportional Representation—166, 212.
 Putney, Squire E.—17, 61, 62, 160, 164, 223, 254.

Q

Quantz, J. J.—18, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.

R

Ramp, B. F.—18, 61, 160, 164, 223, 224, 225, 254.
 Recall, The—166, 212.
 Reilly, James M.—8, 16, 17, 34, 40, 61, 98, 140, 141, 144, 160, 164, 193, 214, 221, 223, 224, 237, 243, 248, 254, 267, 270, 271, 277, 286, 314.
 Resolutions—
 On Appreciation of Arrangements and Services—178.
 On Bills and Ordinances—73.

On Deprecation of Violence—103.
 On Free Speech—122.
 On Immigration—105.
 On the Liquor Question—90.
 On Oppressive Primary Laws—103.
 On Persecution of Mexican Labor Leaders—103.
 On Propaganda Among Soldiers and Sailors—178.
 On State and Local Candidates—73.
 On the Unity Question—123.
 Resolutions Committee—
 Provision for—10, 11.
 Election of—62.
 Reports of—73, 75, 90, 103, 104, 105, 122, 123, 178.
 Minority Report of—123.
 Debates on Reports of—76-91, 103, 104, 106-122, 124-135.
 Rest Period—165, 206.
 Reynolds, S. M.—17, 61, 62, 76, 157, 160, 164, 223, 234, 254.
 Reynolds, W. B.—18, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.
 Rhodes, J. C.—14, 18, 61, 62, 161, 164, 223, 254, 256.
 Rigg, E. L.—17, 61, 62, 161, 164, 223, 254, 273.
 Ringler, Robert B.—18, 41, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.
 Rodgers, E. L.—17, 161, 164.
 Rohrer, Edward J.—17, 61, 62, 160, 164, 223, 254.
 Roll Calls—
 On Washington Case—60, 61.
 On Candidates for President—160, 161.
 On Candidates for Vice-President—164.
 On Motion to Table Substitute for General Program—223.
 On Manner of Electing Executive Committee—254.
 Rose, L. D.—17, 61, 161, 164, 223, 254.
 Ross, C. C.—18, 35, 37, 61, 72, 123, 164, 191, 223, 254, 282, 293.
 Religion—165, 191-206.
 Ryan, R. R.—18, 61, 72, 160, 162, 164, 215, 223, 254.
 Ryckman, A. H.—93, 161, 164, 223.
 Rules Committee Elected by National Committee—
 Report of—9, 22, 25.
 Debates on Report of—10-16, 20-22, 25-33.

S

Sandburg, Charles—18, 61, 62, 161, 164, 223, 254, 310.

Schildge, William—16, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.
 Schwartz, Fred L.—8, 36, 61, 62, 72, 129, 160, 164, 223, 254.
 Secretaries of Convention—9, 10, 19, 258.
 Seeds, Frank E.—17, 61, 161, 164, 223, 254.
 Seidel, Emil—18, 21.
 Sergeant-at-Arms—9, 10, 40.
 Sessions of Convention—
 First Day:
 Morning—7-9.
 Afternoon—9-22.
 Second Day:
 Morning—23-33.
 Afternoon—34-41.
 Third Day:
 Morning—42-61.
 Afternoon—61-63.
 Fourth Day:
 Morning—64-79.
 Afternoon—79-92.
 Fifth Day:
 Morning—93-102.
 Afternoon—103-125.
 Evening—125-164.
 Sixth Day:
 Morning—165-176.
 Afternoon—177-201.
 Evening—201-220.
 Seventh Day:
 Morning—221-229.
 Afternoon—230-257.
 Eighth Day:
 Morning—258-280.
 Afternoon—280-319.
 Shortening Work Day—165, 206.
 Shank, John E.—17, 61, 77, 161, 164, 223, 254.
 Simons, A. M.—11, 13, 17, 41, 44, 48, 49, 58, 59, 61, 130, 132, 135, 137, 138, 139, 141, 142, 143, 148, 150, 151, 152, 160, 161, 164, 165, 167, 169, 170, 171, 172, 175, 186, 187, 188, 191, 204, 206, 211, 212, 213, 214, 217, 223, 226, 228, 229, 233, 234, 235, 254, 264, 270, 273, 275, 276, 297, 312, 319.
 Simons, May Wood—17, 61, 62, 161, 163, 164, 223, 254, 264, 265, 303, 304, 306.
 Slayton, J. W.—9, 18, 61, 62, 66, 67, 111, 156, 160, 162, 163, 164, 179, 188, 191, 202, 203, 223, 233, 245, 254, 262, 263.
 Slobodin, Henry L.—17, 21, 48, 61, 62, 67, 103, 140, 160, 164, 168, 182, 223, 224, 232, 234, 236, 237, 240, 245, 249, 254, 261, 265, 271, 272, 274, 281, 283, 285, 288, 292, 295, 298, 306, 317, 319.
 Smith, Alfred W.—16, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.
 Smith, M. A.—18, 61, 62, 109, 160, 164, 223, 238, 254, 310.
 Snow, W. R.—16, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.
 Snyder, J. E.—17, 61, 62, 127, 160, 164, 187, 223, 231, 250, 253, 254, 256, 269, 285, 295.
 Soldiers and Sailors, Propaganda Among—178.
 Solomon, U.—8, 16, 17, 21, 34, 35, 61, 62, 92, 160, 164, 204, 223, 238, 254, 267, 273, 277, 281, 282, 284, 286, 287, 290, 291, 292, 295, 313, 318.
 Spargo, John—9, 17, 22, 25, 48, 61, 62, 66, 67, 73, 74, 75, 80, 86, 88, 89, 90, 91, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 115, 118, 121, 122, 123, 124, 130, 134, 147, 160, 164, 169, 178, 202, 203, 205, 206, 223, 238, 250, 251, 254, 263, 264, 270, 283, 296, 297, 312, 313, 318.
 Stedman, Seymour—9, 10, 11, 12, 17, 20, 21, 22, 25, 49, 62, 64, 146, 148, 149, 161, 163, 164, 223, 254, 280, 292, 299, 300, 319.
 Stirton, A. M.—17, 61, 101, 125, 161, 164, 199, 223, 231, 254, 260, 318.
 Strebel, Gustave—17, 61, 62, 160, 164, 212, 223, 226, 254.
 Strickland, F. G.—17, 34, 40, 51, 61, 62, 64, 67, 90, 91, 93, 119, 125, 130, 131, 132, 133, 135, 139, 141, 146, 156, 160, 164, 165, 167, 177, 196, 221, 223, 231, 254.
 Strobell, G. H.—17, 61, 138, 145, 159, 161, 164, 223, 254, 274.
 Starkweather, Bertha Wilkins—16, 61, 143, 160, 164, 223, 230, 254, 256.
 Suffrage, Equal, for Men and Women—165, 211.
 Syphers, Grant—18, 61, 161, 164, 223, 254.

T

Tellers—9, 40.
 Temporary Organization—7, 8.
 Thomas, E. H.—18, 61, 62, 123, 161, 164, 223, 254.
 Thompson, Carl D.—18, 37, 61, 62, 91, 152, 153, 154, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 163, 164, 167, 168, 169, 171, 178, 179, 182, 185, 187, 188, 223, 226, 254, 256, 258, 312.
 Thompson, J. C.—18, 61, 62, 161, 164, 223, 254.
 Thorsett, Elias—17, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.
 Toole, William A.—17, 20, 30, 61, 87, 141, 143, 149, 160, 164, 223, 254.
 Tuck, H. C.—8, 16, 34, 35, 36, 61, 138, 160, 164, 223, 254, 279, 313.

Tattle, Howard—61, 62, 74, 76, 78, 117,
158, 159, 161, 164, 223, 248, 254, 266,
270.

U

Unemployed, The—166, 171, 213, 310.

Unity Question—

Majority Report on—123.

First Minority Report on—123.

Second Minority Report on—123.

Debate on—124-135.

Untermann, Ernest—8, 13, 16, 17, 38,
41, 61, 110, 161, 164, 194, 200, 223,
254, 312.

V

Vander Porten, C. H.—17, 57, 59, 61,
160, 164, 172, 204, 205, 206, 213, 223,
254, 256.

Varner, F. C.—18, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.

Vautrim, Fred F.—17, 61, 160, 164, 223,
254.

Veto Power—166, 212.

Voss, Joseph E.—18, 61, 160, 164, 223,
254.

W

Wagenknecht, Alfred—18, 52, 53, 54, 55,
62, 72, 108, 109, 110, 123, 124, 125,
126, 129, 130, 160, 161, 164, 181, 211,
223, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 254, 256,
270, 288, 318.

Waldhorst, F. X.—16, 60, 61, 98, 160,
164, 189, 223, 254, 276, 293, 295, 298,
299.

Walker, John—17, 161, 254.

Wanhope, Joseph—17, 61, 66, 67, 160,
164, 172, 223, 254, 313.

Washington Case—

Credential Committee's Reports on—
18, 34.

National Executive Committee's Re-
port on—43.

Debates on—38-40, 44-60.

Ways and Means Committee:

Provision for—10, 11.

Nomination of—41.

Election of—62.

Organization Referred to—40.

Report of—308.

Weber, Frank J.—18, 61, 62, 161, 164,
223, 254.

Wesleder, Florence—17, 61, 161, 164,
223, 254.

Western Federation of Miners—23-25,
31, 73, 78, 100, 102, 119, 142, 185,
239.

Wheat, Frank I.—16, 61, 92, 98, 143,
144, 160, 164, 221, 223, 230, 254, 312.

White, Dan A.—17, 61, 158, 160, 164,
216, 223, 254.

White, Eliot—17, 61, 160, 164, 197, 205,
223, 254.

Wilke, Max—18, 61, 160, 164, 167, 223,
231, 254, 286.

Wilkins, William H.—8, 17, 61, 160, 164,
223, 254.

Wills, J. G.—18, 61, 62, 160, 164, 223,
230, 254.

Williams, Guy—17, 35, 61, 131, 142, 144,
145, 158, 161, 162, 164, 171, 223, 228,
234, 235, 254, 275, 294.

Wilson, Benjamin F.—17, 61, 62, 123,
160, 164, 223, 254.

Wilson, Lawrence Albert—18, 61, 161,
164, 223, 254.

Woodby G. W.—16, 57, 61, 106, 160,
163, 164, 208, 218, 223, 249, 254, 290.

Women's Committee—

Provision for—10, 11.

Nomination of—41.

Election of—62.

Report of—300, 301.

Minority Report of—301, 302.

Debate on Reports of—302-306.

Women's Committee, Permanent—

Provision for—301.

Election of—306.

Work, John M.—8, 11, 17, 18, 20, 22, 25,
37, 38, 41, 43, 45, 61, 139, 161, 164,
167, 168, 175, 176, 186, 201, 206, 223,
230, 234, 254, 261, 265, 273, 274, 275,
283, 288, 295, 297, 298, 307, 310, 312.

Y

Young, Daniel Kissam—61, 62, 88, 108,
109, 160, 164, 223, 243, 254, 308, 310.

Z

Ziegler, E. J.—17, 61, 160, 164, 223, 254.